


# Jesus and The Educational Method


---

LUTHER ALLAN WEIGLE



BS 2415 .W44 1939  
Weigle, Luther Allan, 1880-  
1976.


Jesus and the educational  
method











# Jesus and The Educational Method

LUTHER ALLAN WEIGLE



THE ABINGDON PRESS

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

**WEIGLE**  
**JESUS AND THE EDUCATIONAL METHOD**

Copyright; 1939, by  
**LUTHER ALLAN WEIGLE**

All Rights Reserved

Printed in the United States of America

## CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
PREFACE . . . . .	7
I. THE DENIAL THAT JESUS WAS A TEACHER . . . . .	11
II. THE CALL TO REPENTANCE . . . . .	40
III. THE KINGDOM OF GOD . . . . .	66
IV. THE GOSPEL AND THE EDUCATIONAL METHOD . . . . .	92
INDEX . . . . .	127





## THE JAMES SPRUNT LECTURES

IN 1911 Mr. James Sprunt, of Wilmington, North Carolina, established a perpetual Lecture-ship at Union Theological Seminary, which would enable the Institution to secure from time to time the services of distinguished ministers and authoritative scholars as special lecturers on subjects connected with various departments of Christian thought and Christian work. The lecturers are chosen by the Faculty of the Seminary and a Committee of the Board of Trustees, and the lectures are published after their delivery in accordance with a contract between the lecturer and these representatives of the Institution.

B. R. LACY, JR.,  
*President.*

Union Theological Seminary  
in Virginia.





## PREFACE

THIS book does not attempt to describe and appraise the particular methods which Jesus used as a teacher. It is concerned, rather, with the general fact that he used what may be termed the educational method as contrasted with the methods of politics, propaganda, or force.

In the stress and confusion of our time, the so-called apocalyptic reading of the life and work of Jesus has led, on the one hand, to the impression that his teaching is without relevance to this present world, and, on the other hand, has been used to justify, in his name, the resort to force. If either of these somewhat contradictory conclusions be true, there can be, in the proper sense of the term, no Christian education; and the churches will either simply shelter those who wait for the coming of the Lord, or will attempt to overcome evil by adopting evil's weapons.

Beginning with the fact that Jesus is represented in the Gospels as a teacher, the present study goes on to consider various types of interpretation which explicitly or implicitly deny the fundamental significance of that fact; and it deals in some detail with the most important of these denials—the thoroughgoing apocalypticism associated with the name of Albert Schweitzer.

The second lecture deals with one of the major questions raised by Schweitzer—Why did Jesus go to Jerusalem? Was it solely to provoke the authorities to put him to death, in order that by his death the gift of the kingdom of God might be wrung from God's hand?

The third lecture inquires what Jesus meant by "the kingdom of God"; and the fourth lecture applies to the Christian faith and life of the churches today and to Christian education the principles revealed by this study as a whole.

I make no claim to originality; this book simply records the results of a fresh study of the gospel records in the light of the work of New Testament scholars, many of whom are cited either in the text or in the notes. I have had to write compactly to bring the material within the compass of four lectures, and I hope that the brevity of my statements concerning various matters which might well have been discussed at more length will not be regarded as evidence either of dogmatic temper or lack of consideration. The notes give my main authorities and indicate lines along which readers may further explore the grounds which underlie the positions here taken.

In 1925 it was my privilege to deliver a course of lectures on the James Sprunt Foundation at the Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia, dealing broadly with the range of prob-

lems involved in the Christian education of American children. Because I was prevented from publishing these lectures by the pressure of new administrative duties, the President and Faculty of Union Theological Seminary most graciously invited me to deliver another series of lectures in February, 1938. These are published in the present volume. I am grateful to President Benjamin R. Lacy, to Dr. W. Taliaferro Thompson, Professor of Christian Education and my host, to their colleagues upon the Faculty, and to the splendid group of ministers, alumni of Union Seminary, whom they brought together for the lectures of their annual Convocation. I owe thanks also to my colleagues, Professor Millar Burrows and Professor Kenneth S. Latourette, and to Dr. Robert W. Ashworth, who read the manuscript and gave me the benefit of their criticisms.

L. A. WEIGLE.

Yale University  
Divinity School.





## CHAPTER ONE

### THE DENIAL THAT JESUS WAS A TEACHER

IT is natural, in view of the self-consciousness of our time with respect to method in education and the concern of many for religious education, that a number of books in recent years should have dealt with the methods of Jesus as a teacher. The best of these are such books as Henry Latham's *Pastor Pastorum*, B. A. Hinsdale's *Jesus as a Teacher*, and T. R. Glover's *The Jesus of History*, which do not sharply dissociate discussions of method from problems of content, but are interested in what Jesus taught as well as in how he taught. Other books deal topically with various phases of method—with Jesus' objectives, his ways of securing attention and interest, his ability as a questioner, his art as a storyteller, his use of problems and projects, his genius in "creative" as opposed to "transmissive" teaching, and so on. Some of these make high claims for Jesus of pre-eminence in teaching method and of central significance in the history of education as well as in the history of religion. "He was a pioneer," says one, "in all that is best in the modern educational movement." "A faithful study of the

## 12 JESUS AND THE EDUCATIONAL METHOD

teaching of Jesus," says another, "will land us in the midst of the most modern thought as to education and give us the best norms of present-day and future-day method."<sup>1</sup>

The writers of these books do not go so far as to assert that Jesus was a conscious practitioner of modern teaching methods or that he discoursed on pedagogy. Most of them would agree with Hinsdale: "Jesus said nothing about a theory of mental growth, or of didactic method. . . . The greatest teachers say little or nothing about the principles or rules upon which they act. They are too intent on using their art to make it prominent; nay, more, they know perfectly well that to make it prominent would defeat their ends. That highest art which conceals art is not conscious but spontaneous; those who show it are implicitly guided by principle and rule, but they are too much absorbed in what they are doing to discourse on the principle and rule according to which they do it."<sup>2</sup>

Yet even this statement, as applied to Jesus, seems to be too self-conscious, sophisticated, modern. It is the comment upon Jesus of a late nineteenth-century teacher of pedagogy, rather than a transcript of anything that can have been present to Jesus' own mind. To a still further degree, it must be admitted, much of the pedagogical exposition, comment, and appreciation



which is contained in recent books upon the teaching methods of Jesus may rightly be charged with the fault of modernization against which Henry Cadbury has issued trenchant warning in his Lowell Lectures on *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus*. The peril is that of attributing to Jesus our own ideas and ideals instead of discovering his. As Bruce Barton pictures Jesus as a modern salesman, Middleton Murry as a man of genius, Thomas N. Carver as an economist, and Karl Kautsky and Bouck White as a social revolutionary, we modern teachers may be too prone to picture Jesus as one of ourselves or as the teacher we should like be.<sup>3</sup>

Two answers may be made to the charge that we are guilty of a pedagogical modernization of Jesus. One is the general answer, recognized by Cadbury, that a measure of modernization is inevitable and necessary in any effort to understand history. We cannot emancipate ourselves from our own time and place, or divest ourselves wholly of the perspective these afford. If we are to study the past at all, it must be by the use of current tools and concepts. That is why each generation must study history for itself; and that is why each cherishes the thought—in part true and in part illusion—that it knows more about history than former generations. No new tool or point of view is to be rejected as profitless just

## 14 JESUS AND THE EDUCATIONAL METHOD

because it is new. The best that we can do is to proceed with such tools and resources as we have, awake to the danger that we may be reading into the data of history more than we find, and seeking to guard as scrupulously against the errors which we may introduce as against those which may be imposed upon us.

The other answer is direct and specific. The point of view which regards Jesus as a teacher is not new, but old. (Jesus *was* a teacher.) The Gospels say so. In that respect the modern appraisals of his teaching method have a clearer basis in the record than the portrayals of him as a business man, an economist, a political rebel, or a protagonist of social reform.

Jesus was a teacher. The four Gospels agree in so representing him. His contemporaries thus spoke of him, and thus addressed him. The word which is most often used in the Gospels to describe what Jesus did is some form of the verb διδάσχω, "teach."

Here indeed was one great difference between Jesus and John the Baptist. John was a preacher, a voice crying in the wilderness, and people went out into the wilderness to hear him as he "preached the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins." His bearing was remote and strange, his life ascetic. (Jesus was a teacher as well as a preacher. He came to folk where they

lived, in cities and towns and countryside. He made friends of even the unlovely, and shared in the daily graces of hospitality. He "came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God," and—what is never said of John—"he entered into the synagogue and taught."

What has come to be called the Sermon on the Mount is not a sermon. Quite aside from the question raised by the fact that Matthew gathers into one discourse sayings which Luke leaves scattered, neither Matthew nor Luke calls this body of sayings or any part of it a sermon; they nowhere say or imply that Jesus was preaching when he spoke these words. Recall how Matthew's version begins: "Seeing the multitudes, he went up into the mountain, and when he had sat down, his disciples came unto him; and he opened his mouth and taught them, saying . . ." Recall how it ends: "And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished these words, the multitudes were astonished at his teaching, for he taught them as one having authority, and not as their scribes."

That sentence records the impression which Jesus produced upon those who heard him—he taught with authority, and not as the scribes. It is a most interesting and significant statement. For the scribes were the recognized teachers of Jesus' day. It was they, not he, who had authority to teach. They had the training, the position

## 16 JESUS AND THE EDUCATIONAL METHOD

of influence and prestige, all that answered in their day to the diplomas, certificates and degrees of our day. He had none of this. (He was just a carpenter. Yet when he taught, folks listened with eagerness.)

Even Bultmann, who calls Jesus a rabbi and holds that he was trained as a scribe, recognizes how different he was from the established teachers of his day.<sup>4</sup> Their authority was external and secondhand; his authority was intrinsic, fresh, and free. The scribes were tied to their books and bound by tradition. And they had multiplied deductions, applications, and exceptions until they were entangled in a thicket of legal technicalities and lost vision and perspective. From all of this Jesus was free. (He saw and thought for himself; and he spoke the truth as he saw it simply and directly, without need or fear of precedent. He spoke with authority, he did not quote authorities. Guignebert, whose *Jesus* is the coldest and most detached of recent scholarly books about him, thus explains the astonishment of the people at his teaching "as one having authority": "The meaning seems to be that he broke away—for good reason—from the form of teaching established in the schools; that he did not necessarily base his preaching upon a text of the Scriptures, to be interpreted and commented upon; and that he did not cite the evidence of famous rabbis; but



that his own inspiration was all that he had need of, even when he appealed to the Book, and the freedom, the homeliness, and the spontaneity of his words were hampered by nothing, not even the attempt to organize them, because they were inspired and justified by an irresistible force."<sup>5</sup>

Jesus' teaching was rooted in actual situations and directed to human need. He was engaged, not in the mere imparting of subjects, but in teaching people. And his method of teaching people was to give himself to them in unstinted friendship, to live with them day by day, and in speech and action to make his resources available to their need. He went about the work of teaching, not as though he had a certain body of material which he must transmit in a proper, logical, predetermined order to his pupils, but, rather, with a clear recognition that here were living, active, needy persons whom he might help to meet wisely the actual circumstances and situations with which they had to do.

The elemental qualifications of a great teacher are a capacity for fellowship, the ability to reveal to his fellows new horizons, deeper insights, and higher goods; and the power to stimulate them to see, to understand, to love, and to do. These qualities Jesus possessed. He knew how to teach. Not by a laboriously acquired technique or by conscious devices of method, but naturally, spon-

## 18 JESUS AND THE EDUCATIONAL METHOD

taneously, simply, directly, interestingly, till people were astonished at the power of his teaching.

But the most important thing is yet to be said. Jesus' spontaneity, his vitality, his friendliness, would have been of little avail had he lacked insight and understanding. His teaching was with authority because it seemed to his hearers to be true. If we read the Gospels attentively, we are impressed with the reasonableness as well as the directness of Jesus' appeal to those who heard him. His tone was not that of a lawgiver, who commands; nor that of a despot, who threatens punishment or cajoles with promises of reward. Jesus spoke as one who discerns the truth, and sets it before others in order that they too may see it and in its light decide the issues which impend. He challenged his hearers to think for themselves, in the light of the relevant facts. He was no propagandist, capturing the minds of people by appeals to prejudice or passion. It was not his way, says Henry Latham, "to inflame the feelings and blind the eyes of men by kindling speech."<sup>6</sup> His language was restrained, sensible, fair; his appeal was to intelligence, conscience, will, rather than to emotion or to the psychology of the crowd.

Here, then, is a central fact about Jesus' way of dealing with people. It was the way of a

teacher. Teaching is not confined to schools. Teaching takes place wherever there is fellowship and communication whereby the more mature or experienced members of a group share with the less mature or experienced the paths that lead toward understanding and self-control. That is what Jesus is represented in the Gospels as doing. Quite aside from subjective considerations or any assumption that we know the inner purposes of Jesus' mind, the objective record of what he said and did is such as to justify the application to him of the title by which the folk of his day addressed him—Teacher. Jesus used the educational method, rather than the methods of politics, or propaganda, or force.

Yet this central fact is from time to time denied, and more often forgotten. Denial that Jesus was a teacher comes today from oddly opposite sources. For some this characterization of Jesus is too mild; others think it to be too resolute. The one party portrays Jesus as militant; the other sketches him as a vagabond.

By advocates of the militant Jesus we are told that he was a working man of Galilee who espoused the cause of his class; that he was an agitator, a revolutionary, a rebel, an incendiary; that he was a Communist; that he undertook a deliberate and devastating antireligious campaign; that those cannot know him who flinch

from class and party strife. The author of a recent *Life of Jesus* repudiates the "pacifist Christ" and "the persuasionist interpretation of the gospel." He asserts that the real meaning of the first beatitude is not "Blessed are the poor in spirit," but "Blessed are the spirited poor." The meek who according to the third beatitude shall inherit the earth are not the meek in our modern sense of the word, he says, but the alert, the generous, those who are good in team work with others. Their meekness is that of Moses, who was "very meek" and "who led a successful strike of bricklayers and slew the Egyptian tyrant."

The modernization involved in such a reading of the gospel data is too obvious to require comment. "The Church may try," concludes one of the chapters from which I have quoted, "but it cannot succeed today in crucifying the Christ. The new Christ is an insurgent Proletariat, the uprisen people of God, and the Church which fails to do him reverence must be cast forth into the outer darkness."<sup>7</sup>

The most striking statement of the opposite view that Jesus' life was without purpose or plan is contained, to the surprise of at least one reader, in the last two chapters of Henry Cadbury's book on *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus*. Cadbury repeatedly uses the word "casual" as descriptive of Jesus' life, and supplements it with other words



and phrases such as "opportunist," "hand-to-mouth," "patternless," "passive fatalism," "by custom and unco-ordinated impulse." He asserts that Jesus probably had no definite, unified, conscious purpose, and suggests that he spent his days in "unreflective vagabondage."<sup>8</sup>

The book is offered as a needed corrective to our modern ways of looking at Jesus; but surely at this point it has overcorrected and shot beyond the mark. There is more in the gospel data in support of the idea that Jesus had a sense of mission than to suggest that he was a casual, unreflective vagabond. Cadbury's argument is confessedly based upon *a priori* considerations; and what is first suggested as a possibility gets transformed without sufficient reason into the assertion of a probability. The descriptive terms which I have quoted constitute another subjective modernization, which is in peril of patronizing Jesus.

The most persistent root of denial that Jesus was a teacher, however, lies in the present popularity of the so-called apocalyptic view of his life and activities. It is the fashion today to assume that Jesus shared in the apocalyptic expectations of many of his countrymen, and that the kingdom of God which he preached was to his mind as immediate, as cataclysmic, as material, and as nationalistic as that for which some of the Jews

## 22 JESUS AND THE EDUCATIONAL METHOD

hoped. Whereas the scholarship of the nineteenth century stressed the differences between the life and teaching of Jesus and popular Messianic expectations, many writers of the twentieth century have tended to emphasize the likeness of Jesus to all that was characteristic of his Jewish heritage and environment, and to select particularly for emphasis its apocalyptic eschatology. Friedrich Heiler writes, "The recognition of the eschatological character of Jesus' gospel is the Copernican achievement of modern theology."<sup>9</sup>

The theological Copernicus who wrought this achievement is Albert Schweitzer, who describes his point of view as that of thoroughgoing, consistent eschatology, meaning by that term not only that there was an eschatological element in Jesus' teaching, but that the whole course of Jesus' life as recorded in the Gospels—his words, acts, sacraments, and death—was determined by his personal commitment of himself to the apocalyptic form of eschatological belief. Few scholars would now defend Schweitzer's full position, which is generally regarded as extreme. Yet he continues to be invoked as the outstanding proponent of the eschatological view of the life of Jesus; and some who admit that in practically every important detail his theory is mistaken, yet maintain that in principle it is true. I propose,

therefore, to sketch briefly the main outlines of Schweitzer's view and to state some of its implications, as a means of raising issues and defining by contrast a more realistic view of the life and teaching of Jesus.<sup>10</sup>

The course of Jesus' life, according to Schweitzer, was determined by an *expectation* and a *secret*. The expectation was that the end of the natural world was at hand, and that in its place there would come to the earth as a gift from the heavens a supernatural kingdom of God, in which the Messiah, who is the Son of man spoken of in the book of Daniel, would reign. Schweitzer holds that Jesus accepted as true "the late Jewish Messianic expectation in all its externality. In no way does he attempt to spiritualize it."<sup>11</sup> This expectation of the Kingdom Jesus preached openly and widely, and sent forth his disciples to proclaim it throughout the villages and cities of Israel.

At his baptism Jesus not only associated himself with John the Baptist's proclamation of the imminence of the Kingdom and the necessity for repentance as a condition of entrance therein, but he also had an experience which disclosed to him the central secret of his life. This secret was that Jesus himself, in the cataclysmic overturning of the forces of the world, would be the Messiah, the Son of man, coming with power

upon the clouds. Jesus kept the secret of his Messianic destiny within his own heart, until he reluctantly disclosed it to his immediate disciples only; and in the end he was crucified because one of them, Judas, betrayed his Master's secret to the authorities.

Jesus' ministry, according to Schweitzer, covered about one year, from spring to the following spring. His public activities were limited to five or six months, for he spent the autumn and winter in retirement in non-Jewish territory alone with his disciples. Jesus' preaching of the Kingdom and that to which he commissioned his disciples were based upon his confident expectation that the Kingdom would come at about the time of the harvest for which the seed had lately been sown. He expected its manifestation, in fact, before his disciples could return to him—"Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel," he told them, "till the Son of man be come."

In this expectation Jesus was disappointed. The disciples returned, and the Kingdom had not yet come. He rejoiced, however, in their report that the unclean spirits were subject to them when they spoke in his name, seeing in this further evidence of the downfall of Satan and of the Kingdom's immediate imminence. But he was perplexed by the fact that the disciples had



not suffered the persecutions which he had foretold that they would suffer, the pre-Messianic tribulation which, as the last attack of the powers of the world, must be undergone before the coming of the Kingdom. Pondering and praying over this unexpected delay, he reached the conclusion, based in part upon the passage in Isaiah 53 concerning the Suffering Servant of Jehovah, that he must bear the tribulation alone, that he must himself suffer death, and that by his death the pre-Messianic tribulation will be rendered unnecessary for all others. He must die in order that the Kingdom may come, and he will after death be manifested in glory as the Messiah, the Son of God.

This conviction was confirmed for Jesus, and his secret was disclosed to his three most intimate friends, at the experience of the Transfiguration, which Schweitzer thinks has been displaced in our Gospels, since it must have occurred before the conversation at Caesarea Philippi and not thereafter. Peter's so-called confession at Caesarea Philippi was, in fact, an unintended betrayal of his Master's secret; and Jesus was obliged, after Peter had blurted it forth, to confide in the whole circle of the Twelve. Jesus went to Jerusalem with the deliberate intention to provoke the authorities to put him to death, but even his most provocative speech and be-

## 26 JESUS AND THE EDUCATIONAL METHOD

havior did not arouse them to this action, until Judas told them the Master's secret. When they arrested him, Jesus confessed this secret in answer to a direct interrogation of the high priest, and they put him to death as a Messianic pretender, a menace both to the religion and to the political security of the Jewish people.

So far as a summary of Schweitzer's sketch of Jesus' career. Let us now note certain outstanding aspects of this view of the life of Jesus.

First, the relative unreality of Jesus' relations to the people among whom he lived. Their attitudes and wants, even their response to his teaching, play no real part in determining the course of his life. That is a drama played between God and himself—a drama in which the people, even the disciples, are almost puppets, lay-figures. The crisis in Jesus' ministry is caused in this view, not by any waning of interest on the part of the people or growing opposition on the part of the religious authorities, but by unaccountable delay on the part of God, who does not send the Kingdom when Jesus expects it. Jesus dies, not because the people reject him or the authorities condemn him, but because God demands it. "For Jesus the necessity of his death is grounded in dogma, not in external historical facts." His was "a mind for which the contemporary world with its historical and social circumstances no

longer had any existence." His one purpose was "to set in motion the eschatological development of history, to let loose the final woes, the confusion and strife, from which shall issue the Parousia, and so to introduce the supramundane phase of the eschatological drama."<sup>12</sup>

Second, according to this view, Jesus was not a teacher. He left Galilee for the northward journey into the regions of Tyre and Sidon because he "was dominated by a 'dogmatic idea' which rendered him indifferent to all else, . . . even to the happy and successful work as a teacher which was opening before him. How could Jesus the 'teacher' abandon at that moment a people so anxious to learn and so eager for salvation? His action suggests a doubt whether he really felt himself to be a 'teacher.' If all the controversial discourses and sayings and answers to questions, which were, so to speak, wrung from him, were subtracted from the sum of his utterances, how much of the didactic preaching of Jesus would be left over? But even the supposed didactic preaching is not really that of a 'teacher,' since the purpose of his parables was, according to Mark 4. 10-12, not to reveal, but to conceal, and of the kingdom of God he spoke only in parables (Mark 4. 34)." He did not "instruct the disciples as to what they were to teach; for they had only to utter a cry." His disciples "are not

his helpers in the work of teaching; we never see them in that capacity, and he did not prepare them to carry on that work after his death. The very fact that he chooses just twelve shows that it is a dogmatic idea which he has in mind. He chooses them as those who are destined to hurl the firebrand into the world, and are afterward, as those who have been the comrades of the unrecognized Messiah, before he came to his kingdom, to be his associates in ruling and judging it." "Jesus was not a teacher, . . . he was an imperious ruler."<sup>13</sup>

Third, even the ethics which Jesus enjoined, as in the Sermon on the Mount or in his enunciation of the principle of service (Mark 10. 35-45), is regarded by Schweitzer as "interim-ethics"—"the special ethic of the interval before the coming of the Kingdom." "There is for Jesus no ethic of the kingdom of God, for in the kingdom of God all natural relationships are abolished." The Kingdom "lies beyond the borders of good and evil; it will be brought about by a cosmic catastrophe through which evil is to be completely overcome. Hence all moral criteria are to be abolished. The kingdom of God is supermoral."<sup>14</sup>

Fourth, Schweitzer's emphasis upon the mystery, the secrecy, the esoteric element in the life of Jesus is driven so far that he comes close to



picturing Jesus as insincere. Jesus speaks to the people, "not to reveal, but to conceal." When he feeds the multitude, "because he is the future Messiah, this meal becomes without their knowledge the Messianic feast. With the morsel of bread which he gives his disciples to distribute to the people he consecrates them as partakers in the coming Messianic feast, and gives them the guarantee that they, who had shared his table in the time of his obscurity, would also share it in the time of his glory." In other words, he is granting them salvation by a sacrament, of which they are not conscious of partaking. ("The entry into Jerusalem was Messianic for Jesus, but not Messianic for the people.") They welcomed him as the prophet who was to come, as Elijah. "The people did not offer Jesus a Messianic ovation at all; it was he who, in the conviction that they were wholly unable to recognize it, played with his Messianic self-consciousness before their eyes." "Similarly, he is playing with his secret in that crucial question regarding the Messiahship in Mark 12. 35-37, 'How say the scribes that the Christ is the Son of David?' "15

Fifth, Jesus, according to Schweitzer's portrayal, is a deluded, visionary fanatic. He has a fixed idea, and that idea is wrong. Even though John the Baptist did none of the things Elijah was to do, and though his death proved that he was

not Elijah, yet Jesus identified him with Elijah, says Schweitzer, simply because his eschatological view demanded it. "Jesus must somehow drag or force the eschatological events into the framework of the actual occurrences." Schweitzer interprets the dark saying about the violent taking the kingdom of heaven by force to mean that the repentant "are engaged in forcing on and compelling the coming of the Kingdom . . . they are wringing it from God."<sup>16</sup> Jesus was mistaken; he forced his own death because he was suffering a delusion. And the worst of it is that he was deluded at just the point where we look to him for light; he failed to understand the nature of the Kingdom, and he failed to understand the character and disposition of God.

Schweitzer's sketch of the life of Christ is not history, but a theoretical and unrealistic interpretation of the data of the Gospels. We cannot, in this brief discussion, undertake in detail to weigh the evidence. That has been done, again and again, by competent Biblical scholars; and the lack of sufficient ground for Schweitzer's extreme position is now generally recognized. It is enough to say that his particular reconstruction of the life of Jesus rests too largely upon deduction from apocalyptic, dogmatic, predestinarian and sacramentarian premises which may be questioned, and depends unduly upon a few passages

in the text of the Gospels which are of debatable meaning or of doubtful authenticity: Mark 4. 10-12, on the use of parables to conceal rather than to reveal; Matthew 10. 23, on the coming of the Son of man before the return of the disciples from their mission to the cities of Israel; Matthew 11. 12, on men of violence taking the kingdom of heaven by force; Matthew 16. 19, on the keys to the kingdom of heaven; and Matthew 19. 28, on the twelve thrones of judgment promised to the twelve disciples.

Schweitzer himself seems to have modified his view in certain respects. It is true that in his recent autobiography he repeats in concise summaries the argument of his earlier works, and sets forth again their outline sketch of the life of Jesus, based upon the presuppositions of thoroughgoing, consistent, apocalyptic eschatology. But there is a chapter on "The Historical Jesus and the Christianity of Today" which contains in principle important modifications of that point of view. He does not hesitate now to stress "the teaching of Jesus," and to speak of "the religion of love which Jesus taught," and of its essential "spiritual and ethical truth." The idea of an "interim-ethic" falls into the background, and he speaks of "the absolute ethic of love." He dwells now upon the "spirit of Jesus," and asserts that liberal Christianity "has the spirit

## 32 JESUS AND THE EDUCATIONAL METHOD

of Jesus not against it but on its side." "Within the Messianic hopes which his hearers carry in their hearts," he says, "Jesus kindles the fire of an ethical faith. Thus the Sermon on the Mount becomes the incontestable charter of liberal Christianity. The truth that the ethical is the essence of religion is firmly established on the authority of Jesus." Further than this he goes on to say: "The religion of love taught by Jesus has been freed from any dogmatism which clung to it, by the disappearance of the late-Jewish eschatological world-view. The mold in which the casting was made has been broken. We are now at liberty to let the religion of Jesus become a living force in our thought, as its purely spiritual and ethical nature demands."<sup>17</sup>

In 1927 was published *The Historical Life of Christ*, by Dr. J. Warschauer, who avows himself a modernist in theology and explicitly states that his volume is an eschatological life of Christ, based upon Schweitzer's presuppositions. It is an interesting, stimulating, thought-provoking book. It is not objective history, any more than is Schweitzer's sketch, for it is an interpretation of the gospel data, along the lines laid down by Schweitzer. Like him, moreover, Warschauer deals largely with the subjective side of the life of Jesus, having much to say about the inside of Jesus' mind, what he thought, how he felt, of



what he was conscious, and of what unconscious, why he decided as he did, and so on. Most of this, of course, is inference.

The most interesting feature of the book lies in its departures from Schweitzer's position. In point after point, Warschauer, attempting to apply Schweitzer's thesis in detail, is forced to emancipate himself from it.

Jesus begins his ministry, Warschauer says, with an exclusively eschatological message; he soon burst its bonds. "His moral grandeur and spiritual insight presently carried him, almost before he became aware of it, far beyond these eschatological speculations, which were destined to remain unrealized. In conscious intention he began the deliverance of his message simply on the note of John the Baptist; by reason of his unique ethical genius and his experience of divine Sonship he emerged as the Christ in a sense which had never yet been associated with that term."<sup>18</sup>

Warschauer uses a number of terms to express Jesus' emancipation from the eschatological point of view. He states that the apocalyptic expectations "were the form, though not the content," of his thought. "If the mold into which he ran his thought was eschatological, the precious metal that flowed into the mold was ethical and spiritual. Or one might say that he had none other

than the already aging wineskins of eschatology to pour the new wine of his teaching into, and the wine quickly burst the skins." "The eschatological fetters sat as lightly upon Jesus as the withes upon the sleeping Samson; he was not even conscious of discarding them."<sup>19</sup>

Warschauer departs from Schweitzer in his emphasis upon the teaching of Jesus, and his book contains an admirable chapter on Jesus as a teacher. He combats vigorously the idea that Jesus' teaching activity was "quite secondary and relatively negligible," and that he taught but an "interim-ethics." "The Christ of history," he says, "notwithstanding his eschatological prepossessions, was very distinctly a teacher, known as such in his lifetime, and remembered as such after his death. By the time the Gospels came to be written, the fervent hopes of the Kingdom being 'at hand' were little more than dying embers, while the Christian ethic burned with a steady flame; in other words, the perishable perished, the enduring endured."<sup>20</sup>

Warschauer rejects as "incredible" the statement of Mark 4. 12 upon which Schweitzer builds so much, that Jesus spoke in parables with the definite intention to conceal rather than to reveal his thought.<sup>21</sup>

In place of the unreal, mysterious, lonely figure of the Jesus whom Schweitzer portrays, absorbed

in the eschatological drama in which God and himself are the only actors, Warschauer pictures Christ as entering actively into the give-and-take of human life, and as taking account, in his teaching and in his behavior, of the human situations in which he found himself. His journey to the north was undertaken, not just because God delayed sending the Kingdom, but because of conflict, apparent failure, and the menace of Herod.

Jesus' Sonship to God, Warschauer holds, was the primary, determinative element in his experience. It was this relation of Sonship, and not his Messianic destiny, that was revealed to him at his baptism. He did not reach the conclusion that he was to be the Messiah until John the Baptist, from prison, sent messengers with the question, "Art thou he that cometh or look we for another?"

So, too, the Fatherhood of God, concerning which Schweitzer has almost nothing to say, is for Warschauer the determinative factor in Jesus' teaching, even in his teaching concerning the Kingdom. "At the center of all his thinking was the Fatherhood of God, and man's relation to the Father in heaven he ever conceived in ethical terms. . . . This conviction was peculiarly his own; by which we do not mean that others did not call God by the name of Father, but that he stood alone in the intensity with which he real-

ized this truth, and made it the criterion of all his thinking and acting. . . . It was this fact—the Divine Fatherhood and the consequences flowing therefrom once it became a fact and not merely a theory—which carried him in instance after instance beyond the limitations of his age and race, rendered him so unconscious of these limitations that he was not conscious of transcending them. . . . Whatever else may be doubtful, it is not doubtful at all that he taught that God's relation to men was that of a parent to his children, and we not only can but must reject anything that is out of harmony with that basal axiom."<sup>22</sup>

With respect to the kingdom of God, Warschauer continually draws a distinction between what he calls the "eschatological form" of Jesus' message and the "substance" of the message. Formally, Jesus was in accord with current ideas—he looked for a Kingdom imminent, material, nationalistic. In substance, he completely transcended the limitations of this view. His conception of the Kingdom was nonvindictive, universal, ethical. He refused to attempt to calculate the date of its coming; he spoke of it as already here, "in the midst of you." Between the form and substance of his teaching there is thus an admitted contradiction, but Jesus is not to be accused of inconsistency. "What we see is the

Lord's own specific genius asserting itself victoriously over those less generous conceptions which formed a portion of his inheritance. We see him at one moment securely fettered in the old views which he had taken over from his environment, as we all do; the next, he has burst his fetters without a conscious effort, as the butterfly bursts the dead integument of its chrysalis state and unfolds its wings in the sunshine."<sup>23</sup>

But in one chief respect Warschauer remains a devoted adherent of Schweitzer's scheme of thoroughgoing eschatology. He pictures Jesus as thinking that the Kingdom is to come by violence, and that the violent may compel its more speedy issuance from the hand of God. It is true that Warschauer means by violence passionate moral devotion, "an heroic ethic," but he also means physical strife, battle, and war. Jesus was driven, he holds, from the hope that the Kingdom might be hastened by the repentance of many to reliance upon the violence of a few, and finally to the self-sacrifice of one, himself.<sup>24</sup>

Warschauer's book is weakest as he proceeds in detail to apply this principle of violence to Jesus' last days in Jerusalem. He pictures Jesus as going to Jerusalem for no other purpose than to provoke the authorities to put him to death, for he was convinced that by dying he would compel the Kingdom to come. But the authorities were



### 38 JESUS AND THE EDUCATIONAL METHOD

singularly broad-minded and patient; they would not put Jesus to death just because his words and acts were provocative. As Warschauer portrays Jesus' successive attempts to rouse them to kill him, he piles up phrases to express Jesus' grim determination—he "seeks death"; he resolves "by one superlatively bold stroke to set in motion those forces which would compel the Kingdom to appear"; he hoped for a "quick, clean finish in some stormy fray."<sup>25</sup> The picture is that of a hectic, frustrated, deluded man whose pitiable-ness is in no wise lessened by the fact that Warschauer tries to compensate for it by multiplying reverential modes of reference to him—the Holy One, Lord, Saviour, Son of God, Captive.

Two impressions persisted in my mind when I completed reading this section of Warschauer's book. One of these, which is not especially important, is that if Jesus had really behaved as Warschauer makes him, I should have sympathized with the rulers and priests. The other, which is tremendously important, is that the whole picture is out of harmony with the character of God—the character of God as Jesus himself understood it, preached it, and lived it. It is out of harmony with the Fatherhood of God. Can we believe that Jesus sought a violent death because of a delusion so utterly counter to the determinative belief of his life? Can we believe that

he died to force God's hand, he who even early in his career regarded a similar suggestion as a temptation from Satan?

The trouble is that Warschauer does not go far enough in attributing to Jesus emancipation from the current apocalyptic ideas. His recognition of the Divine Fatherhood, says Warschauer, "carried Jesus in instance after instance beyond the limitations of his age and race, rendered him so unconscious of these limitations that he was not conscious of transcending them."<sup>26</sup> The first half of that sentence is true; can we think that the second half is true? How does Warschauer know that Jesus was not conscious of transcending these limitations? He portrays a Jesus who is a supreme religious genius, who is as no other the Son of God, yet who remains singularly obtuse, stupid, deluded, on this one point. If Jesus saw as much of the truth as he did, in Warschauer's theory, he must have seen more. He must have understood, far more clearly than this theory admits, the implications for his own life and for the life of mankind of the Fatherhood of God.

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE CALL TO REPENTANCE

JESUS was more than a teacher; he was a man of action. The impression conveyed by the Gospels, Professor Dodd rightly insists, is not that Jesus was "just an eminently sound and practical teacher, who patiently led simple minds to appreciate the great enduring commonplaces of morals and religion." "The teaching of Jesus," he goes on to say, "is not the leisurely and patient exposition of a system by the founder of a school. It is related to a brief and tremendous crisis in which he is the principal figure and which indeed his appearance brought about."<sup>27</sup>

If it is the error of apocalypticism to assume that Jesus was concerned only with a future, catastrophic, miraculous, supramundane Kingdom, it has been the fault of liberalism to picture him as interested only in the long future of mankind. Both theories overemphasize Jesus' concern for the future. Both tend to empty of significance the actual situations in which Jesus lived and his relations to the people of his generation. To the extent that they do this, both theories are unrealistic. Jesus lived a truly human life. His words were addressed to real people,

for real reasons, and meant to convey real meanings to them, not just to subsequent generations; his deeds were real actions, meant to accomplish something then and there, rather than posing and play-acting for the sake of posterity. There runs through all the record a sense of the immediate relevance of Jesus' teaching and of its urgent importance.

We have become so accustomed to speak of Jesus as an idealist that we tend to forget that the opposite term may as truly be applied to him. Jesus was a realist. The picture which the Gospels afford of him is that of one who calmly, fearlessly, faced the facts. He sought no escape from hard realities. He was disconcertingly direct in his dealings with people. He was always puncturing the insincerities, the rationalizations, the day-dreams and pretensions, which were as abundant in his day as in ours.

It is as a gesture of realism that we may best understand Jesus' dramatic entry into Jerusalem on the day which we celebrate as Palm Sunday. The triumphal entry, it is sometimes called; but there was little of triumph about it and a total lack of pomp and circumstance. Judged in the light of any ordinary standards of regal splendor, military display, political campaigning, or effective advertising, it was a rather pathetic and anticlimactic affair. Jesus rode from Bethany upon

a young ass, followed by his disciples, who were somewhat puzzled and anxious, and welcomed by a motley crowd of folk from the country districts who had come to Jerusalem for the Feast of the Passover and were hoping to find in him the expected Messiah. The procession started according to scheduled specifications, for there was a well-recognized prophecy that the Messianic King would come in such guise:

“Tell ye the daughter of Zion,  
Behold, thy King cometh unto thee,  
Meek, and riding upon an ass,  
And upon a colt, the foal of an ass.”

But it failed to end in Messianic style, for Jesus did not leap to the pinnacle of the Temple, rend the clouds of heaven, summon a vast army of angels and archangels, expel the Romans from power, and compel them to bow their faces to the earth before his throne and acknowledge him to be sovereign. That was the orthodox program. That was what the Messiah was expected to do. Jesus did none of these things. He wept as he came in sight of the city, and prophesied its coming destruction. When he reached the Temple, “he looked round about upon all things,” the record says, and then returned to Bethany. The crowds melted away. It was a tame ending to their extravagant hopes.



I am aware that it has been suggested that Jesus himself was befooled that day—that he expected, if not a miraculous interposition of the armies of heaven, at least an uprising of the people, and that he was bitterly disillusioned. Yet of all the actors in that drama, he was the one most clearly in possession of himself, most obviously in command of the situation. No, it was not Jesus, but the devotees of Messianic hopes who were disappointed in the outcome of that procession. I believe that it was a deliberate act of realism on Jesus' part. He staged that Messianic entry to awaken his people to the unreality and futility of their nationalistic dream. He accepted Messiahship by his act in fulfillment of the ancient prophecy; he thereby declared himself to be the Messiah; but he refused to behave as folk expected the Messiah to behave.

Jesus had more in mind than this merely negative gesture. It was not without purpose that when he entered the Temple, he "looked round about upon all things." He was reconnoitering for the morrow's campaign. For he had come to Jerusalem not simply to enter the city and to teach the people, but to do a daring thing. He had determined to attack the priestly clique of Sadducees who controlled the Temple and who were turning to their own gain even the piety of Israel.

He made the attack on the next morning. Mark gives the best account of what happened. "He entered into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold and them that bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold the doves; and he would not suffer that any man should carry a vessel through the temple. And he taught, and said unto them, Is it not written, My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations? but ye have made it a den of robbers."<sup>28</sup>

We fail to realize the significance of this act of Jesus if we think of him simply as denouncing the petty graft of a money-changing and bird-and-animal-selling monopoly. The language that he used is far too serious for that. It is drawn from two ancient prophecies. One is from Isaiah, "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations." The other is the scathing word of Jehovah with which Jeremiah rebuked the rulers of his time: "Amend your ways and your doings. . . . Trust ye not in lying words, saying the temple of Jehovah, the temple of Jehovah. . . . Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely . . . and come and stand before me in this house, which is called by my name, and say, We are delivered; that ye may do all these abominations? Is this house, which is called by

my name, become a den of robbers in your eyes?"<sup>29</sup>

Jesus could not have chosen more biting words from the Old Testament than these. And we can be sure that the Sadducean clique understood his allusion, and caught the full force of his denunciation. We are not surprised that Mark goes on to say: "The chief priests and the scribes heard it, and sought how they might destroy him; for they feared him, for all the multitude was astonished at his teaching."

Annas and Caiaphas and the Sadducean party of which they were the head were in control of the Temple and its revenues. Religion was the one thing that Rome left strictly alone; here the Jews governed themselves. But this group of Jewish priests had grown skeptical, secularist, selfish, cynical. They were fattening upon religion; they regarded the Temple as for their enrichment, rather than for the salvation of the people or for the glory of God. And they were determined, by whatever expedient, to retain their place of privilege and their license to exploit their countrymen.

The Sadducees had abandoned any religious idea of Israel's vocation, any thought of winning the world for Jehovah. They had sinned against religion until they had become impervious to any sincere religious appeal. I quote a few sen-

tences from Stephen Liberty, whose remarkable book on *The Political Relations of Christ's Ministry* deserves to be more widely known: "The official atmosphere of Jerusalem was fatal to any stirrings of national repentance, for repentance meant the recognition of Israel's duty to the world, and any such duty interfering with their own position of privilege the rulers had long ago repudiated. If the last demand for 'the fruit of the vineyard' came with unique credentials—if they suspected that they were this time face to face with a movement which summed up all the absurd and inconvenient enthusiasms of prophetic religion—the more reason, if they could, to uproot the whole dangerous and impolitic set of ideas at one blow, that they might be free to work their own aggrandizement without further let or hindrance. 'This is the heir; come let us kill him and the inheritance shall be ours.' Such was the terrible, though logical, issue of an attitude which had long regarded divine favor as a prize to be grasped and held for the benefit of the possessor merely."<sup>80</sup>

If this be true, as I am sure that it is, how silly are the complaints of those who see in this cleansing of the Temple an act of sudden, impatient anger against the petty bargainers at the tables of exchange! There is anger here, but it is no sudden gust of temper. It is deep-seated moral indigna-

tion. Jesus came to Jerusalem to confront the Sadducees and priests. That is why he was so sure that at Jerusalem he would be put to death.

But it seems equally mistaken to say that Jesus came to Jerusalem in order that he might be put to death. Warschauer's picture of Jesus seeking death, "hoping for a quick, clean finish in some stormy fray," a brave, but desperate, frustrated, deluded fanatic, is drawn not from history, but from imagination.

The truth is much simpler than that. It is put directly in sentences which I quote from Professor B. W. Bacon: "If the question be raised of Jesus' purpose in going to Jerusalem, it must be answered quite simply from what he actually did. He did not go there in order to be crucified, but to fulfill his mission to Israel in spite of the menace of the Cross. He went up to claim his Father's house as a house of prayer for all Israel," and for all the nations.<sup>31</sup> The object which Jesus had in view was an act of national, and more than national significance. It was to rescue religion from those who were using it as a means of the exploitation of mankind.<sup>32</sup>

Schweitzer says that one might use as a principle of division by which to classify the lives of Christ, whether they make him go to Jerusalem to work or to die. He holds that Jesus went to Jerusalem solely in order to die there, and that



the cleansing of the Temple is devoid of meaning except as a way of provoking the authorities to kill him. I suggest that Schweitzer's alternative is unnecessary, and that Jesus went to Jerusalem to work even at the risk of death. His exposure of the emptiness of the popular Messianic hope, and his denunciation of the misuse of the Temple, together with his subsequent teaching in the Temple courts, had positive content and significance beyond serving merely to irritate and provoke.

It has become the fashion of our modern skeptics to say much to the effect that Jesus was an obscure carpenter, that he lived in a little land and never traveled far, that he had no experience of war, that he did not marry, that he was unacquainted with Greek art and philosophy, that he knew nothing about automobiles, radios, motion pictures, industrial machines, and airplanes, and that our unquestionably historical information about him is too meager to permit the writing of a biography in the modern manner. It is easy to exaggerate and overemphasize the differences between life in Jesus' day and life today, and to infer that because the externals have so much changed, the central problems of human living are now totally unlike the problems that Jesus faced.

The truth is that Judea and Galilee in the

time of Jesus were in their human problems and passions much like any of the more turbulent countries in this present, modern, distracted time of ours. Overpopulation, exorbitant double taxation, declining productivity of the soil, discrimination against the farmer, and the rapid growth of cities with their usual proletarian need and discontent, had resulted in social cleavages and economic distress which contributed, only forty years after Jesus' death, to rebellion, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the passing from history of the Jewish nation. Fortunately, we have now, in F. C. Grant's little book on *The Economic Background of the Gospels*, a convenient marshaling of the facts which have hitherto been scattered. After citing the various kinds of taxes paid to Rome, including not only direct tribute, but customs-duties for import and for export, sales-taxes upon merchandise, highway and bridge tolls, poll taxes, etc., he reminds us that "the civil or political taxation was imposed over and above the religious dues demanded of the Jewish nation by the Law. The Law had been established as the theoretical legislation of the priestly theocracy, in which no provision was made for civil or military obligations. Under the Romans, therefore, there was a twofold taxation of the Jewish people, civil and religious; each of these had been designed without regard

to the other, and therefore could not be modified in its favor. . . . If we may hazard an approximation, where no exact figures are available, the total taxation of the Jewish people in the time of Jesus, civil and religious combined, must have approached the intolerable proportion of between 30 and 40 per cent; it may have been higher still."<sup>33</sup>

There can be little wonder that the mood of the people was increasingly rebellious. In the very year, 6 A. D., when the Jews, as a result of their own petition, were brought under the direct rule of Rome, one Judas led a revolt in Galilee, which issued in the burning of the largest city in that territory, Sepphoris, and the enslavement of its inhabitants. Other agitators appeared from time to time, leading local movements of revolt which were quelled by the Romans. Zealots, whose cry was freedom or death, "robbers," and *sicarii*, bands of secret assassins, grew in number. The final rebellion began in 66 A. D. and in the year 70 Jerusalem was captured and destroyed.

It is impossible to think that Jesus knew nothing of these things or cared nothing for the plight of his people. Sepphoris was the great city of which Nazareth was a suburb. He was a boy of between five and ten years of age when it was destroyed by the Romans, and he must have seen

and heard something of the tragic issue of that futile revolt. He was a youth of fifteen to twenty years when Sepphoris was rebuilt, and it is possible that he was there employed as a carpenter.<sup>34</sup> As a man he foretold the destruction of Jerusalem and wept over its impending doom—a prophecy that required no miraculous gifts, but simply the exercise of insight and understanding.

The significant fact is that Jesus, in the face of social, economic, and political conditions as distressing as similar conditions in our own time, did not become a class protagonist or a social revolutionary or a political rebel. He had a program for his people; but it was not a program of direct action. It was a program of repentance and of faith in God.

This concentration by Jesus upon an ethical and religious program is regarded by Rabbi Klausner as his monumental mistake. His teaching and action were not, says Klausner, to the advantage of Judaism and therefore not to the advantage of humanity as a whole through the medium of Judaism. His program was the negation, the ruin of the Jewish national culture, the national state and national life. "For a religion which possesses only a certain conception of God and a morality acceptable to *all* mankind, does not belong to any special nation, and consciously or unconsciously, breaks down the barriers of

nationality. This inevitably brought it to pass that his people, Israel, rejected him. . . . Israel's leaders looked for the time when all creatures should fall down before one God and all be made one society to do his will with a perfect heart. And the people knew, if once they compromised their nationality, that that ideal would be left with none to uphold it, and that the vision would never be fulfilled. . . . Two thousand years of non-Jewish Christianity have proved that the Jewish people did not err."<sup>35</sup>

Many of Klausner's arguments in this connection seem to me to be incredibly flimsy. He cites the question of the disciples after the resurrection, "Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" as proof that *Jesus* expected the Kingdom to be restored to the Jews *in the political sense*; and he takes this strange position just after he has been arguing that Jesus' teaching is the negation of all national life and aspiration for the Jews. He cites Jesus' response to the man who wanted him to bid his brother divide the inheritance with him, as evidence that Jesus had no regard for justice.<sup>36</sup>

Let us look at this latter case more closely. Jesus was teaching. He was in the midst of one of the instructions to his disciples which Matthew has included in the collection of sayings of Jesus which we call the Sermon on the Mount. He



was speaking in the presence of one of the largest multitudes that ever came to hear him—"many thousands . . . were gathered together," says the ancient record, "insomuch that they trod upon one another." Jesus had reached a high point in his discourse, and was speaking of courage and of truth, of the fatherly care of God and of guidance by the Holy Spirit.

Then one out of the multitude interrupts. He rises in his place among the audience on the fringe of the group of disciples, and signifies his desire to speak. That was proper enough, for Jesus, like the Jewish teachers generally, encouraged question and answer. But to everyone's amazement, what the man said had absolutely nothing to do with the subject that Jesus had been discussing or, indeed, with any subject of common interest. It concerned him alone. As he sat there, he had conceived the idea that Jesus might help him with a little private scheme he had been cherishing. So he puts his request: "Teacher, bid my brother divide the inheritance with me."

Quick and sharp as a whiplash comes Jesus' answer: "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?" . . . Then he turns to the audience and begins again to teach; but now his subject is the foolish and unlovely thing that he has seen in this man. "Take heed," he says, "and keep

yourselves from all covetousness; for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." And he tells the story of a man who trusted in riches and was by his riches befooled.

Jesus himself indicates that the point of this incident is to be found in the sin of covetousness and the folly of greed. Jesus' condemnation is extended, not to a reasonable regard for material well-being, but to the disposition to find in things the supreme values of life and to amass wealth in excess of one's real needs. The word which is translated "abundance" means "superfluity." Jesus' warning is that you cannot measure the happiness or worth of a man's life in terms of the superfluities he manages to acquire. Jesus' teaching bears directly upon the legitimacy of what we now call the "profit-motive." The whole subject is of tremendous consequence, especially in these days when even the most protected and the most stupid among us cannot fail to sense the economic disaster into which mankind has blundered and the ruin which threatens us all. We cannot avoid that ruin, I believe, except by a clearer realization and fuller commitment to Jesus' principle that persons, not things, are of ultimate value, and that things are instruments only. Wealth may be a good servant, but it is a terrible master. The possession of things may

enhance and brighten human life; but things can enslave the human spirit, and drive it to despair.

Yet Klausner uses this incident to prove his contention that the teaching of Jesus is destructive of national life and the national state. In Jesus' saying, "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?", according to Klausner, he "disregards justice generally, even when it is a case of natural civil interest, free of any ill motive; he thus ignores anything concerned with material civilization; in this sense he does not belong to civilization." That is a tremendous conclusion to draw from such slender and really irrelevant premises.

In spite of such flimsy arguments as these, Rabbi Klausner is correct in maintaining that a major difference between Jesus and the Jews who rejected him lay in the fact that Jesus was not a nationalist. To their minds, and to Klausner's, speaking as a Jew today, the precious heritage of God's revelation could be preserved and transmitted only through the maintenance of the integrity of the Jewish race and nation. Jesus saw that, unless they repented, the Jewish people would lose their heritage and have little to transmit; and he so brought the gospel of God to bear upon the minds and hearts of a little band of disciples that his teaching was able to survive the destruction of the Jewish nation. It must

have been for this reason that in the latter part of his ministry he deliberately seems to have discontinued any wide public appeal and centered his efforts upon the teaching and training of the disciples.

But what called for repentance? The sins which are our common human weakness, of course; but something more than these. The gospel records plainly point to a national sin, which called for a national repentance.

We have not sufficiently explored what Jesus had to say about the more common sins. He taught that these are matters of inward thought and desire as well as of overt act; and he condemned the sins of the spirit, pride and hardness of heart, even more strongly than the sins of the flesh. An exceedingly instructive passage is Mark 7. 21-22, where he gives a list of things which defile a man, that is, cut him off from fellowship with God. They are things that come from within, out of the heart of men; and the list includes, in addition to theft, murder, and sexual lust, evil thoughts, covetousness, malice, deceit, jealousy, railing, that is scornful and abusive speech, the pride that despises others, and the folly or moral obtuseness that renders one insensitive to right claims and obligations.

There are three occasions, according to Mark, when Jesus became angry. One was when he was

about to heal the man with a withered hand, and put to those in the synagogue the question, "Is it lawful on the sabbath day to do good or to do harm? To save a life or to kill?" They kept silent, and he "looked upon them with anger, being grieved at the hardening of their heart." Again, when the disciples tried to prevent folk from bringing to him little children, he was "moved with indignation." Finally his anger blazed forth, as we have seen, at the exploitation of the Temple worship for the enrichment of the Sadducean clique who controlled it. "Thus we see his anger kindled," says Professor Anderson Scott, "by inhumanity claiming the sanction of religion; by the misrepresentation of religion involved in making it an excuse for such inhumanity; by the privileged blocking access to their privileges for those whom they looked on as inferior; by religion turned into a means of oppression of the many and aggrandizement for the few."<sup>37</sup>

These occasions, together with the moral faults for which he denounced the Pharisees, help us to understand the national sin for which nothing less than national repentance was demanded. It was the sin of the misuse and exploitation of religion itself. The very revelation of God which it had been the specific genius and privilege of the Jewish people to receive, was being



cramped and hindered and emptied of meaning by the religious authorities. The religion of these authorities had become legalistic, over-institutionalized, proud, narrow, exclusive. And the Temple worship had fallen into the hands of a secularist, selfish, cynical priesthood who were using it for their personal enrichment.

We have become so accustomed to attribute the economic distress and the political unrest of the Jewish people in the first century A. D. to their resentment against the political rule of Rome and the taxation and tribute Rome exacted, that we tend to forget that their distress was also due to the very heavy burden of religious taxation for the support of the priestly hierarchy, the Temple, and the Temple worship. Schürer says: "The contributions which the priests received from the people for their support before the Exile were variable and irregular. After the Exile they were immeasurably increased. In this connection it is noteworthy how greatly the priesthood grew in power and influence under the new order of things which succeeded the Exile. The truth is that this increase in power was not only the cause of their increasing claims to authority, but also a result of the enlargement of their material income. The later scribes, who were not always favorably minded toward the priesthood, were unable to alter the situation, for

the priestly law had long been accepted as the Law of God. Indeed, the scribes succeeded only in still further increasing this traditional source of priestly income. Upon the principle that a man acquired the more of merit in the sight of God as he the more punctiliously and readily fulfilled the requirements of the Law, they interpreted the legal obligations almost wholly in a sense favorable to the priests. And so we behold the remarkable state of affairs of a time when men had already begun to look upon the hierarchy with suspicion, and yet labored might and main to establish still more securely the privileges and prerogatives of the priestly class."<sup>38</sup>

The result was, as Professor Bacon reminds us, that the Temple at Jerusalem was not only one of the strongest fortresses, but one of the richest banks in Syria.<sup>39</sup> In 63 B. C. Pompey found 2,000 talents of sacred money in the Temple, which he left untouched. A few years later Crassus found in the same place four times as much—8,000 talents, which he took. If these were gold talents, Crassus' booty amounted to the staggering figure of \$240,000,000; if silver talents, it would amount to \$16,000,000. Josephus felt it necessary to explain that all this wealth, accumulated in the Temple, had not come from the people of Palestine alone: "Let no one wonder that there was so much wealth in our Temple,

since all the Jews throughout the habitable earth, and those that worshiped God, nay, even those of Asia and Europe, sent their contributions to it, and this from very ancient times. . . . Now we have no public money but only what appertains to God."<sup>40</sup>

If that explanation be granted, it yet remains true that the constantly mounting Temple treasury, to which the people paid their tithes and taxes first, as due to God in fulfillment of the Law, which they believed to be his will, represented a tremendous draft upon the resources of the Jewish people, who were also compelled, over and above this, to pay taxes for civil, political, and military purposes to Rome. Surely, Jesus must have had this in mind when he spoke of the scribes and Pharisees who sit in Moses' seat, and "bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with their finger." Or when he denounced them for devouring widows' houses, "while for a pretense ye make long prayers." Or when he spoke of the gold of the Temple: "Woe unto you, ye blind guides, that say, Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor. Ye fools and blind; for which is greater, the gold, or the temple that hath sanctified the gold?"<sup>41</sup>

I do not wish to strain the evidence, but it is significant that when Jesus was questioned, "Is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar, or not?" he answered: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's." The Jewish people had asked for the rule of Rome, and must pay for it. But when he was asked to pay the Temple tax, he did that as a matter of concession. Though we be free, he told Peter, yet "lest we cause them to stumble," pay the shekel for me and thee.<sup>42</sup> It is significant that he taught freedom from the mechanical exactitudes and ceremonial refinements of the Law in the face of opposition but without harm or even determined hindrance; but when he began to deal with the interests of the priestly hierarchy, he was soon put to death.

The Law itself had become an instrument of oppression of God's people; the Temple stored the proceeds of their exploitation. Against this wickedness, this prostitution of religious faith to inhumane and unworthy ends, stands the kingdom of God—the sovereign righteous will of God, the overruling power of God in the affairs of men which brings to frustration their evil and their folly. The kingdom of God, said Jesus, is at hand, is come upon you. God is manifesting himself in judgment upon wrong and in mercy to the repentant. "Think ye that these Galileans

whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices were sinners above all Galileans, because they have suffered these things? I tell you, Nay; but, except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish. Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and killed them, think ye that they were offenders above all the men that dwell in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay; but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish."<sup>43</sup>

Jesus' call was for repentance, for a turning about of the lives of men, for more sensitive and sound ethical judgment, for action motivated by love of God and of fellow men. It was a call to religious awakening and reformation. But it was also the only practicable and hopeful program of social reform and of political welfare for the Jewish people.<sup>44</sup> There is much to be said for the thesis of Mr. Stephen Liberty, in the book on *The Political Relations of Christ's Ministry*, to which I have already referred, that Jesus' appeal for national repentance was more sagacious, more genuinely realistic as a proposal of public policy than any other program that was open to this discontented and rebellious nation.

It is always hazardous to venture an opinion as to what might have been. We never know. But there are at least these possibilities. A genuine repentance on the part of the Jewish people and their leaders might have eased the



rigors of the Law in the interest of human welfare, recognizing that God desires mercy more than sacrifice, and that laws and institutions exist for man, rather than man for them. There might have been a reduction of the heavy burden of religious taxation that rested upon the Jewish people, for this, unlike the Roman taxation, rested entirely in their own hands. There might even have been some distribution to meet real human needs, of funds drawn from the Temple treasury, instead of piling it up to the ostensible glory of God and to the enjoyment of the priestly rulers. This much, at least, national repentance might have meant for the easing of the social burdens and economic tension of the times.

It might too have made livable the relations between the Romans and the Jews. It was the exclusiveness, the intolerance, the fanatic confidence of the postexilic Jews in themselves as the only chosen people of God that made the situation so difficult that it could issue in nothing else than the destruction of their capital and their nation. National repentance might have recalled them to the sublime ethical faith, the universalism, and the sense of mission to the Gentiles, which were characteristic of the great Hebrew prophets.

When asked for a sign, Jesus answered: "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a

sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonah the prophet." Matthew uses this saying twice, Luke once; and they differ so completely in their explanations of what the sign of Jonah means that this fact suggests that both are guessing. Matthew is the less plausible; he holds that it means that "as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."<sup>44</sup>

But surely the "sign of Jonah" is to be found in the meaning of the book that tells his story. That book was a protest against the narrowness and vindictiveness of postexilic Judaism—a protest hot from the heart of some great-minded Jew who was indignant at the spirit of exclusiveness and bigotry that obsessed many of his people, and who sought to bring them to their senses. The figure of Jonah is a caricature of their spirit. He is delineated with unmistakably bold strokes as in many respects noble, courageous, spiritually sensitive, yet inconsistent, peevish, ridiculous, the victim of his own silly hatreds, reproaching God for his mercy to a people who had sinned in ignorance and repented in faith.<sup>45</sup> By the sign of Jonah, Jesus is holding a mirror to the Jews of his own day, and is pointing them to the love and care of God for all men, whether of the chosen people or not. If they had grasped and accepted

the sign of Jonah, they might have lived on better terms with the Romans. Perhaps they might even have escaped the destruction which befell them within a generation after the Crucifixion.

## CHAPTER THREE

### THE KINGDOM OF GOD

I AM seeking to set before you a point of view with respect to the human life of Jesus which is realistic. Jesus was not, in my judgment, a visionary devotee of apocalyptic eschatology, bending every effort to force the hand of God, and seeking death because of a delusion concerning God's character and purpose. He was a teacher of truth. But he was more than a teacher; he was a man of action. In a desperate crisis in the fortunes of his people he saw the issues clearly, counseled wisely, and dared to oppose the error and the evil that in the end conspired to slay him. So well did he teach, so rightly did he act, that his death became his triumph, his teaching survived the political ruin of the Jewish nation, and what had been but a crisis in the affairs of a small and little-regarded people became the dividing point in human history, so that thereafter events are dated "Before Christ" or "In the year of our Lord."

We must go further, of course, than these particular facts. We are on the way to a true apprehension of Jesus only as we pass beyond his action to his suffering, beyond the Temple protest to

the naked figure on the Cross, and beyond the Crucifixion to the Resurrection. We fail, moreover, to understand the Jesus of history until we learn of the Christ of experience. We shall not learn the meaning of the events of his life until we reflect upon them in the light of their full consequence in human history as men have lived in the power of his Spirit. Yet it is important to begin aright, to base our further reaches of understanding and faith upon as much knowledge as we can get of the historical facts—what Jesus actually said and did in the real human relations and situations that beset him.

At no point is this more important than with respect to Jesus' use of the phrase "the kingdom of God." He began his ministry with the proclamation: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent, and believe in the gospel."<sup>46</sup> This message remained central in his teaching. That it is of primary, essential significance all students of the Gospels would agree; but as to just what Jesus meant by the kingdom of God there is much disagreement.

At the one extreme stand the apocalyptic eschatologists, who insist that Jesus meant by the kingdom of God nothing other than a miraculous, catastrophic divine intervention in the immediate future, which would destroy the old world-order, and replace it with a new heaven



and a new earth, wherein the chosen people of God would realize to the full their special privilege. I have indicated my dissent from this point of view, which seems to me to involve an undue reliance upon Jewish apocalyptic sources and a misreading of the gospel data. "It is considered a perverse procedure in similar cases," said Harnack, "to judge eminent, epoch-making personalities first and foremost by what they share with their contemporaries, and to put what is great and characteristic in them into the background."<sup>47</sup>

At the other extreme stand the humanists, who use the phrase "kingdom of God" as the equivalent of human social welfare, who exhort their fellows to "build" the kingdom of God as though it were something men could make of brick or stone, and who are inclined to forget that the Kingdom is God's gift, or, indeed, that God has anything to do with it at all. Bouck White, in his dashing book entitled *The Call of the Carpenter*, wrote: "The modern reader can perhaps grasp the 'kingdom of heaven' as Jesus used it—so far as a single phrase can embody it—by substituting for it in every case another term, 'the kingdom of self-respect.' " Jesus' purpose, White held, was "economic and only secondarily religious," and his "theological equipment was of the slenderest." His prime concern was "to

arouse the common people to a sense of dignity and leadership.”<sup>48</sup> This is modernization unrestrained and misleading.

The antithesis between these two types of interpretation is stated clearly in the Hale Lectures on *Christ in the Gospels*, by Burton Scott Easton, who is himself a confident protagonist of the apocalyptic point of view. He arrives at the strange conclusion, however, that Jesus had “not one set of religious ideas, but two.” He holds that Jesus had “a complete ethic and complete soteriology” based on his experience of the Fatherhood of God and another ethic and soteriology based upon apocalypticism. To the objection that these two sets of ideas are inconsistent he has no answer except that “what the twentieth-century Occidental deems mental sanity is a poor criterion to apply to first-century Galilaeans.” That savors of what psychologists call “projection”—the projection upon the figure of Jesus of the confusion into which apocalypticism plunges its advocates.<sup>49</sup>

Easton unduly simplifies the issue, and wins too easy a victory for his apocalyptic view, when he writes: “Jesus used ‘kingdom of God’ not as a new creation of his own, but as a term perfectly familiar to his hearers, as something that every school child could define. Therefore, except in so far as he explicitly and unambiguously modi-

fied the definition, we must assume that he and his hearers used the phrase in the same sense." This statement, with the assertions which it introduces, ignores the fact that the phrase "kingdom of God" is not used in the Old Testament and is not to be found in the apocalyptic books, except for one passage that is doubtful and later than Jesus' lifetime.<sup>50</sup> No other literature of that time or earlier uses the term as the Gospels do. The statement ignores the fact, again, that various and conflicting forms of the Messianic hope were current among the Jews of the first century, and that any popular use of the phrase "kingdom of God" must have reflected these diverse views.

Even if there were a clear use of the phrase "kingdom of God" in the apocalyptic literature—which there is not—and if there had been popularly current, answering to this, only one simple meaning of the phrase which "every school child could define," it would not follow that Jesus used the term in that sense. Surely, he brought to its use his own personality, his own insight, his own experience of God. "It is bad criticism," says Glover, "to give to the words of genius the value or the connotation which they would have in the lips of ordinary people. To a great mind words are charged with a fullness of meaning that little people do not reach."<sup>51</sup> With this principle Professor Ernest F. Scott agrees. "Jesus' view of the

Kingdom," he says, "is not to be determined by careful comparison of passages in apocalyptic and rabbinical literature, but in the light of the great ideas which pervade his own teaching. While he took over a traditional hope he recast it, informing it with those convictions which had come to him out of his own experience of God. . . . The rule holds good of all great teachers that the idea which they receive, and which they perhaps imagine themselves to be merely expounding, becomes in their minds a different one. . . . It is even more true of Jesus that none of his ideas can be understood from its parallels in ordinary Judaism. All that was given him was woven in with his own thought and must be interpreted in the light of it. This is true, above all, of his main conception of the kingdom of God."<sup>52</sup>

The argument that we must assume that Jesus used the phrase in the popularly current sense, "except in so far as he explicitly and unambiguously modified the definition," is not cogent. It is the practice of great teachers—like Socrates and Jesus and many another—to start with their pupils where they are, provisionally accepting their ideas and their language, and then by various means to stimulate thinking, action, communication, reflection, discovery, until these pupils find themselves changed and in possession of quite new ranges of understanding. Only the

dull and uninspired teacher, like the scribes, abounds in definitions and insists that everything should be explicit and unambiguous. The teacher who is really in fellowship with his pupils, their leader and inspirer, stirring them to think for themselves, recognizes that in the beginning such definitions are a barrier, and in the end unnecessary.<sup>53</sup> What is here true of teachers is true also of men who serve the public weal and lead the people in action. The absence of explicit and unambiguous modification of definition is certainly—and rightly—no guarantee that the leader in any field shares in all respects the opinions and judgments of those whom he is called to lead.

Three characteristic features of Jesus' message concerning the kingdom of God appear in Mark's record of the proclamation with which he began his preaching and teaching in Galilee: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel."

First, the good news that the kingdom of God is at hand constitutes a call to repentance. But Jesus does not say that repentance is a condition upon which the coming of the kingdom of God depends. The kingdom of God is at hand: that is proclaimed as a fact, not as contingent upon human behavior. The obvious meaning is that the kingdom of God is here, or is immediately



imminent, and that this is true whether men repent or not. It is implied that the nonrepentant may not share the blessings of the kingdom of God, but not that they can prevent its coming. There is no implication that repentance is a means of hastening the kingdom of God, or of building it, or of wringing it from the hand of God.

Second, the fact that the kingdom of God is at hand is proclaimed by Jesus as the gospel, good tidings, good news. It is not a threat, but a cause for rejoicing. Here is a major difference between Jesus and John the Baptist, whose preaching was concerned with the imminence of the divine judgment. John's message is keyed to fear; Jesus' message has the note of gladness. John urges repentance as a means of escaping "the wrath to come"; Jesus, as a way of entering or receiving the kingdom of God.

Third, the proclamation that "the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand," connotes the ending of an era and the beginning of a new age. God is manifesting, or will shortly manifest, his kingly will; and thus brings into human reach a goal toward which history hitherto has looked or tended.

It is a common saying among New Testament scholars today that if we are to understand the teaching of Jesus, we must learn to "think Semiti-

cally." Most of what Jesus said was doubtless spoken in the Palestinian Aramaic of his day. Not only the language in which his thought was expressed, but the content of the thought and the actions with which it was associated were characteristically Semitic. So only could his thoughts and actions convey real meanings to his contemporaries; so only could they be relevant to the human situation.

But how shall we learn to think Semitically? Shall we rely largely upon the apocalyptic literature which expressed the hopes of many of the Jewish people in the period "between the Testaments," or upon the rabbinical literature of the period following the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersal of the Jewish nation, or upon the opinions, orthodox or liberal, of Jewish scholars today? All of these are of value. But for the understanding of Jesus there is a more important Semitic source. This is the Old Testament, particularly as it embodies the teaching of the great Hebrew prophets. Here is the primary Semitic resource for the interpretation of the meaning of Jesus' life and teaching; the others are secondary.

The full range of these Semitic resources is drawn upon, with discrimination and insight, by T. W. Manson in his study of *The Teaching of Jesus*. After a brief treatment of the form of Jesus' teaching, the book is devoted to a discus-

sion of its content which is in effect a comprehensive exposition of the meaning of the kingdom of God as Jesus proclaimed it and taught it. Instead of the usual pottering about with paradoxes—the kingdom of God is future yet in some sense present; within you but also among you; sudden but in some respects gradual; cataclysmic yet growing—Manson suggests that most of these seeming contradictions may be resolved by taking account of the threefold meaning of the phrase “kingdom of God” as it may be taken to refer to the sovereignty of God, or to the obedience of man, or to the goal of history.<sup>54</sup>

The primary meaning of the phrase “kingdom of God” is the *kingship* of God. That is the fundamental significance both of the Hebrew *malkuth* and of the Greek βασιλεία, of which “kingdom” is the translation. The phrase connotes the kingly rule, the reign, the sovereignty of God. It is not, in this primary sense, a name for a geographical area or a political unit or a social order. It does not denote those over whom God rules, but, rather, his kingly power and active will, in manifestation or exercise of his sovereignty. “The Lord shall reign for ever and ever,” is the triumphant conclusion of the song of Moses and the children of Israel at the Red Sea (Exodus 15. 18). “The Lord is our king,” proclaims Isaiah (33. 22). “The kingdom is the

Lord's, and he is the ruler over the nations" (Psalm 22. 28). "The Lord hath established his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom ruleth over all" (Psalm 103. 19). The whole of the 145th Psalm is a song of praise in commemoration of the sovereignty and goodness of God:

"I will extol thee, my God, O King;  
 And I will bless thy name forever and ever. . . .  
 All thy works shall give thanks unto thee, O Lord;  
 And thy saints shall bless thee.  
 They shall speak of the glory of thy kingdom,  
 And talk of thy power. . . .  
 Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom,  
 And thy dominion endureth throughout all generations."

The same thought is expressed in the apocalyptic literature and in the extra-canonical Psalms of Solomon:

"His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom,  
 And his dominion is from generation to generation." (Daniel 4. 3.)

"The might of our God is forever with mercy,  
 And the kingdom of our God is forever over the nations in judgment."  
 (Psalms of Solomon 17. 3, 4.)

The following passage from the book of Enoch is especially interesting for its combination of the verbosity characteristic of the apocalyptic litera-

ture with an expression of faith akin to that of the prophets and the Psalms:

"When I had gone forth below and seen the heaven, and the sun rising in the east, and the moon setting in the west, and a few stars, and the whole earth, and everything as He had made it in the beginning, then I blessed the Lord of judgment and extolled Him because He had made the sun to go forth from the windows of the east, so that he ascended and rose on the face of the heaven, and set out and kept traversing the path shown unto him. And I lifted up my hands in righteousness and blessed the Holy and Great One, and spake with the breath of my mouth, and with the tongue of flesh, which God has made for the children of the flesh of men, that they should speak therewith, and He gave them breath and a tongue and a mouth that they should speak therewith:

"Blessed be Thou, O Lord, King,  
Great and mighty in Thy greatness,  
Lord of the whole creation of the heaven,  
King of kings and God of the whole world.

"Thy power and kingship and greatness abide forever and ever,  
And throughout all generations thy dominion;  
And all the heavens are Thy throne forever,  
And the whole earth Thy footstool forever and ever."  
(Enoch 83. 11-84. 2.)

I am reluctant to pile up evidence for a point that is generally conceded. But this primary meaning of the phrase "kingdom of God," and



the fact that this is the primary meaning, are so often conceded and then forgotten by present-day writers, who throw the main burden of their discussion upon secondary meanings of the phrase, that it may be well to cite the judgment of some modern scholars. Gustaf Dalman: "There can be no doubt that in the Old Testament as in Jewish literature, *malkuth* as related to God always means 'kingly rule' and never 'kingdom.'" George Foot Moore: "By Malkut Shamaim, 'the kingdom of Heaven,' is to be understood not the realm over which God rules, but his kingship, his character of King." K. L. Schmidt: "Die wesentliche Bedeutung nicht *Reich*, sondern *Herrschaft* ist."<sup>55</sup>

In this primary sense of the term, the old issue as to whether the kingdom of God is to be regarded as present or future is transcended. There is no point in asking whether the Reign of God is present or future, says Manson, "just as there is no point in asking whether the Fatherhood of God is present or future."<sup>56</sup> God *is*. "I AM THAT I AM" is the name of God revealed to Moses. "His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion is from generation to generation." It is clear also, that, in this primary sense, the kingdom of God is not dependent upon the response or efforts of men. God is King; men do not elect him. Neither are the ideas of growth or

increase applicable to the kingdom of God in this primary meaning of the phrase. God's sovereignty is not something that begins in a small or feeble way and gains maturity or strength only with the passage of time.

Man's part is to "seek," to "receive," and to "enter" the kingdom of God; that is, to acknowledge and accept God's sovereignty, to repent of sin and self-will, to choose God rather than Satan or mammon or self as the ruler of his life, and to respond to God with faith, trust, obedience, and loyal service. It is, in an ancient phrase of the Jewish liturgy, to take upon himself "the yoke of the kingdom of heaven."

As men thus accept and seek to fulfill God's will, the relation contemplated in his kingdom becomes effective on earth. It is a personal relation between God and human beings, both as individuals and as communities or peoples. And to those who are God's loyal subjects, the term "kingdom of God" may be applied in a proper though secondary sense. To the kingdom of God in this sense the ideas of growth and increase may of course be applied.

It was the faith of the Hebrew people that the will of God will prevail, and that there will come a time when all shall acknowledge his rule. This will be the final consummation of the kingdom of God; it is the goal toward which human history

is directed. Jesus taught his disciples to pray for this: "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is done in heaven." Professor George Foot Moore quotes, in illustration of the meaning of this petition, the prayer Alenu of the Jewish Prayer Book, which dates back to the first half of the third century: "We trust in thee, O Lord our God, that we may soon behold the glory of thy power, to cause the idols to pass away from the earth, and the false gods shall be utterly cut off; to perfect the world in the reign [kingdom] of the Almighty, and all the children of flesh shall call upon thy name; to turn unto thyself all the wicked of the earth. Before thee, O Lord, our God, they shall bend the knee, and prostrate themselves; and give honor to thy glorious name. They shall take on them the yoke of thy sovereignty [kingdom], and do thou reign [be king] over them soon, forever and ever. For thine is the kingdom, and forever thou wilt reign in glory, as it is written in thy law, 'The Lord shall reign [be king] forever and ever.' And it is said, 'The Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day the Lord shall be one and his name one.'"<sup>57</sup> Moore holds that this prayer unquestionably expresses the conception of the kingdom of God at the beginning of the era following the destruction of Jerusalem. The various apocalyptic books provided a wealth of imaged detail as to the

manner and date of the coming of the kingdom of God, in this final and complete sense, and as to the portents, conflicts, and catastrophes which would attend its coming.

Jesus used the phrase "kingdom of God" in each of these three related, yet distinct, senses: as referring to the sovereign will of God, to its becoming effective in the lives of believers, and to the final consummation. In respect to each of these senses of the term, his teaching had its roots in the Hebrew prophetic tradition, but was more than a mere transcript of current notions. It sprang with new and vital meaning from his knowledge and experience of God as Father.

Much depends, for our understanding of the teaching of Jesus with respect to the kingdom of God, upon the perspective in which it is viewed and the relative priority assigned to its three directions of reference. It is the policy—and, as I think, the error—of the apocalyptic eschatologists to take a particular view of the final consummation as the fixed point, the fundamental premise, and to assume that Jesus' view of God's sovereignty and of man's duty must be in line with that. This procedure is that of a "consistent" or "thoroughgoing" (konsequent) apocalyptic interpretation of Jesus' life and teaching. The opposite procedure is sounder. Jesus' view of the character of God as King and Father is basic

and determinative. God exercises his sovereignty in accordance with his nature and his purpose for mankind. It is in the light of Jesus' teaching about God that we are to understand his view of duty and of destiny.

Jesus expected the final consummation of the kingdom of God to be soon, probably within the lifetime of some to whom he spoke. Yet he refused to calculate or predict the date—a proceeding dear to the apocalyptic writers. "Concerning that day or that hour no one knows," he said, "not even the angels in heaven, nor even the Son, but only the Father."<sup>58</sup>

Jesus' teaching concerning the final consummation differs from that of the apocalyptic writers in many other respects. It was not so rigidly deterministic. The Apocalypses abound in schemes of chronology, depicting periods through which history must pass according to a predestined plan which cannot be changed. Their appeal, which is usually indirect rather than direct, is to the faithful and righteous, who are comforted by the assurance of ultimate victory and encouraged to endure to the end; the appeal is not to sinners, to repent and be converted. The general principle of Apocalyptic, says Goguel, is expressed in Revelation 22. 11—"He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still." It is just the opposite



of Jesus' statement: "I am not come to call the righteous to repentance, but sinners."<sup>59</sup>

The Apocalypses, again, stress greatly the idea of conflict, and depict the final consummation in terms of a world-shaking battle in which the forces of righteousness—either the Chosen People, or the Messiah, or angels, or God himself—will slay or finally crib and confine the forces of evil. I quote a few passages which are typical of many:

"I saw till a great sword was given to the sheep [Israel] and the sheep proceeded against all the beasts of the field [Gentiles] to slay them, and all the beasts and the birds of the heaven fled before their face."  
(Enoch 90. 19.)

"After that there shall be another, the eighth week, that of righteousness, and a sword shall be given to it that a righteous judgment may be executed on the oppressors, and sinners shall be delivered into the hands of the righteous." (Enoch 91. 12.)

"Then the hands of the angel shall be filled  
Who has been appointed chief,  
And he shall forthwith avenge them of their enemies.  
For the Heavenly One will arise from His royal throne,  
And He will go forth from His holy habitation  
With indignation and wrath on account of His sons . . .  
For the Most High will arise, the Eternal God alone,

And He will appear to punish the Gentiles,  
And He will destroy all their idols."

(Assumption of Moses 10. 2, 3, 7.)

"And I beheld, and lo! the wind caused to come up out of the heart of the seas as it were the form of a man. And I beheld, and lo! this Man flew with the clouds of heaven. And wherever he turned his countenance to look everything seen by him trembled; and whithersoever the voice went out of his mouth, all that heard his voice melted away, as the wax melts when it feels the fire. And after this I beheld, and lo! there was gathered together from the four winds of heaven an innumerable multitude of men to make war against the Man that came up out of the sea. And I beheld, and lo! he cut out for himself a great mountain and flew up upon it. . . . And after this I beheld, and lo! all who were gathered together against him to wage war with him were seized with great fear; yet they dared to fight. And lo! when he saw the assault of the multitude as they came he neither lifted his hand, nor held spear nor any warlike weapon; but I saw only how he sent out of his mouth as it were a fiery stream, and out of his lips a flaming breath, and out of his tongue he shot forth a storm of sparks. And these were all mingled together—the fiery stream, the flaming breath, and the storm, and fell upon the assault of the multitude which was prepared to fight, and burned them all up, so that suddenly nothing more was to be seen of the innumerable multitudes save only dust of ashes and smell of smoke."

(4 Ezra 13. 3-11.)

Compare with this the scene of the Last Judgment described in Matthew 25. 31-46, and there is little need of further comment. In Jesus' teaching concerning the final consummation the pictures of battle so characteristic of the apocalyptic literature have been displaced by the idea of a Judgment of all mankind, based upon ethical response to opportunity. Jesus' conception of the kingdom of God is not nationalistic, favoring the Jewish people at the expense of their enemies. It is ethical and universal, for the Gentiles also are to be judged, without prejudice or favor. "The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation and shall condemn them: for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, a thing greater than Solomon is here. The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a thing greater than Jonah is here."

The teaching of Jesus concerning the final consummation is not vindictive, as were many passages in the apocalyptic literature.<sup>60</sup> He sought no revenge upon the enemies and oppressors of his people. There are no passages in the Gospels like these from the Apocalypse of Ezra and the Assumption of Moses:

"And the Most High shall be revealed upon the throne of judgment:

and then cometh the End  
and compassion shall pass away,  
and pity be far off,  
and longsuffering withdrawn;

And then shall the pit of torment appear  
and over against it the place of refreshment;  
The furnace of Gehenna shall be made manifest,  
and over against it the Paradise of delight.

And then shall the Most High say to the nations  
that have been raised from the dead:

Look now and consider whom ye have denied,  
whom ye have not served, whose command-  
ments ye have despised.

Look, now, before you:  
here delight and refreshment,  
there fire and torments!

Thus shall he speak unto them in the Day of Judgment."

(4 Ezra 7. 33, 36, 37, 38.)

"Then thou, O Israel, shalt be happy,  
And thou shalt mount upon the necks and wings  
of the eagle. . . .

And He will cause thee to approach to the heaven  
of the stars,

And He will establish thy habitation among them.  
And thou shalt look from on high and shalt see  
thy enemies in Gehenna,

And thou shalt recognize them and rejoice."

(Assumption of Moses 10. 8-10.)

The teaching of Jesus is free from the exuberant, fantastic imagery characteristic of the apocalyptic literature. It contains nothing resembling Enoch's vision (Chap. 85-90) of stars that became bulls and cows that gave birth to elephants; or the description in 4 Ezra 5. 4-9 of the last days, when the sun shall suddenly shine forth by night, trees drip blood, stones cry out, fire burst forth, and women bear monsters; or the promise of 2 Baruch 29. 4-5 that in the days of the Messiah men will feast upon the flesh of Behemoth and Leviathan, kept by God from creation for that purpose, and that each vine shall have a thousand branches, each branch a thousand clusters, each cluster a thousand grapes, and each grape shall produce a *cor* (about ninety gallons) of wine. Bultmann rightly says that "Jesus rejects the whole content of apocalyptic speculation, as he rejects also the calculation of the time and the watching for signs."<sup>61</sup>

The sum of the matter is that Jesus' teaching concerning the kingdom of God was eschatological, but not apocalyptic. Jesus, says Montefiore, "markedly differed from the apocalyptic seers in keeping more closely than they to the teaching of the oldest and the greatest of the prophets."<sup>62</sup> Jesus taught, as did they, that history moves in a direction, under the hand of God. It is not a meaningless succession of accidents, or an end-



less repetition of cycles. However far men, like sheep, may go astray and wander every one to his own way, the resources of God are sufficient, and the will of God will prevail. Because Jesus looked forward to the final consummation of the purpose of God, his teaching was in this respect eschatological. But it differed so widely, and in so essential respects, from the teaching of the apocalyptic writers, that it is misleading to speak of it as apocalyptic. This is in spite of the fact that Jesus used some terms—notably “Son of man”—which had gained currency in apocalyptic books. He used the language and thought-forms of his day. Goguel, who holds that the thought of Jesus about the kingdom of God was definitely eschatological but not apocalyptic, but draws the distinction in somewhat different terms than I have used, says, “He thought in eschatological terms just as he spoke Aramaic, but that which is most intimate and essential in his thought may not be connected any more closely with eschatological thought than with the Aramaic tongue.”<sup>63</sup>

One major respect in which Jesus’ teaching differed from that of the apocalyptic writers remains to be mentioned. He did not share the view, so common among them, that God has for a time withdrawn and left this present world to the control of the powers of evil. Be it granted

that Jesus spoke of demons and of Beelzebub and of the kingdom of Satan; he speaks of these as the enemies of God and man, but not as powers to which God has for a time permitted free course and control in seeming usurpation of his place. God's reign is not broken; his care is not withdrawn.

The passage in the Sermon on the Mount which begins, "Be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on," is wrongly viewed if it be regarded as a bit of insouciance associated with the feeling that the end of the world is imminent and that what is so soon to be destroyed is not worth bothering about.<sup>64</sup> This passage is distinctly not apocalyptic nor eschatological in character. It has nothing to say about the end of the world. Jesus' counsel, "Be not anxious," is based upon the premises that God is our Heavenly Father, that his care is constant even for birds and flowers and the grass that is fit only to burn, that his provision is certain for the human life that is of much more value than these, that anxiety is needless and futile, and that it is good sense to face life's problems and duties when and as they come. The unfailing trust in God's providence, the realization of God's living, sustaining, Fatherly presence which Jesus here expressed, is one of the most

characteristic features of his life and teaching. In this sense, at least, the kingdom of God is not regarded by Jesus as coming; it is here.

But in a yet more specific sense, Jesus proclaimed to his contemporaries that the kingdom of God was present among them. The good news he asked them to believe was more than that the kingdom of God is just around the corner. He asserted not only the eternal sovereignty and the unfailing providence of God, but the present, active deed of God. He taught that God was doing something, then and there, which those who had eyes to see could discern. We shall turn to the evidence for this in the next lecture. Until we have canvassed this evidence, our exposition of Jesus' teaching concerning the kingdom of God is incomplete.

Let me conclude today by reminding you that Jesus gave to the concept of the kingdom or sovereignty of God, a new meaning, and a new warmth and depth, by his teaching of the Fatherhood of God. God is for him not the sort of a father that a king would be; he is the sort of king that a father would be. "If ye then, who are evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?"<sup>65</sup> A description of the kingdom of God, which should not be forgotten, is that by Professor A. B.

Bruce, who defined the kingdom of God, in Jesus' teaching, as "the reign of divine love exercised by God in his grace over human hearts believing in his love and constrained thereby to yield him grateful affection and devoted service."<sup>68</sup>

## CHAPTER FOUR

### THE GOSPEL AND THE EDUCATIONAL METHOD

THE most distinctive feature of Jesus' teaching concerning the kingdom of God is found in his sayings which assert or imply its presence. His opening message, be it granted, may mean either that the kingdom of God is very near or that it is here.<sup>67</sup> Other sayings resolve this ambiguity. They declare that the kingdom of God is now manifest, a fact of present experience for those who have eyes to see and the will to obey.

The most explicit of these sayings is the reply to those who accused Jesus of alliance with Satan: "If I by the finger of God cast out demons, then has the kingdom of God come upon you." Scarcely less explicit is: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, Lo, here! or there! for behold, the kingdom of God is within you."<sup>68</sup> The alternative translation, "the kingdom of God is among you," also affirms the presence of the Kingdom. To John the Baptist's question from prison, "Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?" Jesus answered, "Go and tell John the things which ye hear and



see." Then he went on to speak of John in terms generously appreciative of his character and work, yet unmistakably declarative of the difference between John's message and his own: "Among them that are born of women there is none greater than John: yet he that is but little in the kingdom of God is greater than he."<sup>69</sup> The one thing that is clear about the dark saying which follows concerning men of violence who since the days of John the Baptist are taking the kingdom of God by force, is that the kingdom of God is here to be taken. Rudolf Otto translates this saying: "From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of God exercises its power and men of violence seize it"—the men of violence being those who will take great risks and make every needed sacrifice to enter the kingdom of God. Whether or not this translation will win general acceptance, the saying, in its context, contrasts two periods of history: that of the law and the prophets, to John's ministry, and that of the kingdom of God, since his ministry.<sup>70</sup>

The presence of the kingdom of God is implied in the beatitude which Luke places after the return of the Seventy: "Blessed are the eyes which see the things which ye see: for I say unto you, that many prophets and kings desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them

not.”<sup>71</sup> It is implied, again, in the saying: “The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation, and shall condemn them: for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, a thing greater than Solomon is here. The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with the men of this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a thing greater than Jonah is here.”<sup>72</sup>

That the kingdom of God is here to be entered or received is implied in such sayings as those about receiving the kingdom of God as a little child; about seeking first the kingdom of God and his righteousness; about the scribe who answered so discreetly that Jesus said, “Thou art not far from the kingdom of God”; and about the publicans and harlots who “are entering the kingdom of God before you.”<sup>73</sup>

Of crucial significance are the parables concerning the growth of the kingdom of God. Mark alone records the parable of the seed which grows of itself: “So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed upon the earth; and should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring up and grow, he knoweth not how. The earth beareth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. But when the fruit is ripe, straightway he putteth forth the

sickle, because the harvest is come." All three of the Synoptic Gospels have the parable of the mustard seed. Luke's version is: "Unto what is the kingdom of God like? and whereunto shall I liken it? It is like unto a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and cast into his own garden; and it grew, and became a tree; and the birds of the heaven lodged in the branches thereof." Matthew and Luke add to this the parable of the leaven: "Whereunto shall I liken the kingdom of God? It is like unto leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till it was all leavened."<sup>74</sup>

These are parables, not allegories; and it is idle to inquire about details, such as the ecclesiastical meaning of the branches of the mustard tree, or why the housewife took just three measures of meal. The main point, which these parables have in common, is that the kingdom of God grows as do seeds, silently, imperceptibly, not as a result of human striving or mechanical addition, but from within, because of a resident power that is of God.

In these and other sayings which express or imply the presence of the kingdom of God, Jesus is clearly not referring to the final consummation, but to the kingdom as God's sovereignty and as man's response. The primary emphasis is upon the kingdom as God's sovereignty, God's kingly

power and rule. This it is which "has come upon you," which brings about "the things which ye see," which is "a thing greater than Solomon," "a thing greater than Jonah." Even in the parables of growth, which are descriptive of the human response to God's rule the reference to the divine power is unmistakable. "In this group of parables of the kingdom," says Professor Bacon, "the chief lesson is the present, inward working of God's Spirit, unseen by dull or hostile eyes, a kingdom which is already in the midst, silent, omnipotent, overtaking unawares those whose spiritual eyes are closed."<sup>75</sup>

It is not the sovereignty of God as a status, a constitutional, changeless, eternal relation, something merely to be contemplated with reverence, that Jesus proclaims; it is God's present deed, God's sovereignty in action, here and now doing something in and for men, that is to be received and trusted and obeyed and made the basis for further action on man's part. Quite aside from subsequent reflections as to the meaning of the life and work of Jesus, and quite aside from all theological formulations concerning him, it seems to be plainly indicated in the Synoptic records that Jesus discerned in the crisis of his nation a new manifestation of the sovereign will of God, an act of God declaring himself in judgment and in mercy, ready to forgive and seeking

the trust and obedience of men as a father desires the trust of a son. This is strikingly expressed by Rudolf Otto in *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn*: "All his works and words . . . are directly or indirectly inspired by the idea of a divine power breaking in, to *save*. This has its immediate correlate in the 'new' God whom he brings, the God who does not consume sinners, but *seeks* sinners; the Father-God, who has now once again *drawn near* out of his transcendence, who asks for the child-mind and childlike trust."<sup>76</sup>

The meaning of the word "gospel" as used by Mark is not explicable in terms of classical or contemporary Greek usage, but may be clearly understood in the light of the Greek translation of the Old Testament which we know as the Septuagint. The Hebrew verb which in our English versions appears as to tell, bring, publish, or preach good tidings, is represented in the Greek by the verb *εὐαγγελίζω*, which corresponds to the noun *εὐαγγέλιον*, "gospel." We may be helped to grasp the meaning if we use the word "gospel" as noun or verb, even though it be awkward English, in such passages as:

Isaiah 40. 9. "O thou that tellest gospel to Zion, get thee up on a high mountain; O thou that tellest gospel to Jerusalem, lift up thy voice with strength."

Isaiah 52. 7. "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth gospel of



peace, gospel of good, that publisheth salvation, that saith unto Zion, thy God reigneth."

Psalm 96. 2. "Sing unto the Lord, bless his name:  
Gospel forth his salvation from day  
to day."

Isaiah 61. 1. "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me: because the Lord hath anointed me to preach gospel unto the meek."

In these and other passages, the verb *εὐαγγελίζω* is used to express the telling of good news about God, the good news that God is making bare his arm and manifest his righteous rule, that he is acting, or is about to act, and that his action brings mercy, forgiveness, deliverance, comfort, strength, salvation. He gives "a garland for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness." The good news, the gospel, is not simply that God is what he is, but that God is doing, or is about to do, a mighty and gracious thing.

Jesus applied to himself and his message this idea of the gospel which is contained in the Old Testament prophecies. According to Luke, he read one of these prophecies in the synagogue at Nazareth:

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,  
Because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel  
to the poor:  
He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives,

And recovering of sight to the blind,  
 To set at liberty them that are bruised,  
 To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord."

He closed the book, Luke goes on to say, gave it back to the attendant, and sat down. The eyes of all in the synagogue were on him, and he began to say to them: "Today hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears."<sup>77</sup> The kingdom of God is proclaimed by Jesus as the gospel—the good news that God is now fulfilling his promises, now doing that to which the prophets looked. It is a fulfillment not just in word but in action. To John the Baptist's question Jesus is able to answer by pointing to what he is doing: "Go and tell John the things which ye hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached unto them."<sup>78</sup>

Jesus identified himself with his message. He lived it. He proclaimed and taught the gospel, not only by what he said, but by what he did and was. In him the kingdom of God was present, both as the act of God and as the response of man. To canvass the evidence for this would take us into a study of the meaning of the term "Messiah" or "Christ" as accepted by Jesus, his use of the term "Son of man," his reference to himself as "the Son" and his designation by others as

"the Son of God," his sayings concerning his sufferings and death, and the extent to which his conception of his mission was influenced by the picture of the Suffering Servant in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. These are questions of the utmost importance, into which we cannot go in the brief compass of these lectures. Let me say simply this, that the easy assumption of the late nineteenth-century criticism that a clear distinction can be drawn between the gospel of Jesus and the gospel about Jesus has proved to be fallacious. Harnack's dictum that "the gospel, as Jesus proclaimed it, has to do with the Father only and not with the Son" now appears to be too simple for the facts. New Testament scholars are no longer so confident that they can discriminate in the Gospels between an original tradition which was supposedly non-Christological and a later Christological interpretation.<sup>79</sup>

What seems amply justified by the evidence is that Jesus believed that through him God was effecting a mighty action for the salvation of men. This does not mean that he felt himself to be wringing it from the hand of God, like Prometheus. It was God's initiative, God's action. His part was to obey, to be used of God, to do his Father's will, and so to reveal that will to men and lead them too to receive and accept it, thus to enter the kingdom of God. It was not an

interpretation alien to Jesus, but in accord with "the mind of Christ," to use Paul's phrase, when Paul said that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself."<sup>80</sup> Or when the author of the Gospel according to John wrote: "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life."<sup>81</sup> When we ask, after nineteen centuries, whether the gospel which Jesus taught is the discovery of human religious genius or the act of God in self-disclosure and redemptive power, we must answer that it is both, for Jesus was a man, but that surely it is the act of God. That is what the gospel affirms. To imagine that God waits idly or impotently until some man shall discover him would be to contradict the very nature of the God whom Jesus revealed as King and Father.

The great fact, which seems a paradox to all who have not learned of Jesus, is that the act of God was not spectacular or catastrophic, with a stunning show of supernatural power. It was not wind or earthquake or fire, but a voice. The kingdom of God was manifest in a man.

"They all were looking for a king  
 To slay their foes and lift them high:  
 Thou cam'st a little baby thing  
 That made a woman cry."<sup>82</sup>

## 102 JESUS AND THE EDUCATIONAL METHOD

Jesus did not read the entire passage from Isaiah which he took as text on that Sabbath day in the synagogue at Nazareth. He stopped in the middle of a sentence and ended with the phrase, "to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." If he had gone on, the next phrase was "and the day of vengeance of our God." His abrupt cutting short of a familiar prophecy, and his gesture in closing and returning the book, may have been the reason why the eyes of all were fastened on him in strained attention as he began to speak. The omission was significant. Jesus' conception of the kingdom of God and of his own anointing—his Messiahship, for "Messiah" means "Anointed"—would not permit him to complete the sentence. He had not been sent to proclaim the day of God's vengeance. Professor James Moffatt, commenting on this incident, quotes a pertinent passage from the *Epistle to Diognetus*: "Was He sent to rule, to inspire fear and terror? By no means. God sent Him in gentleness and meekness, as a king sending his royal son . . . ; sent Him to save, to persuade, not to use force, for force has nothing to do with God."<sup>88</sup>

The early Christians were interested in what Jesus had done, and would do, rather than in what he taught. The apostolic preaching was not concerned so much to preserve the sayings of a



dead teacher as to proclaim a living Lord. It is natural that this should have been so. The Crucifixion ended one relation to Jesus; faith in the Resurrection began another. The disciples had to make the transition from association with the Jesus of history to faith in the Christ of experience. The predominant notes in the thought of the early Church were the Resurrection, the Passion and death, the fulfillment of prophecy, and the Second Coming. Its preaching centered about the ideas that in Jesus the promised Messiah (the Christ) had come; that he had suffered, died, and arisen; that all this was according to the Scriptures; that through him salvation is offered and the forgiveness of sins to be secured, but that repentance is necessary and urgent; and that he is shortly to come again as Judge of the living and the dead.<sup>84</sup>

In view of this predominant interest in the action and sacrifice of Jesus, the surprising fact is not that the Gospels have so little of his oral teaching, but that they contain so much. And in view of the prevalent apocalyptic hope of the early Christians it is astonishing that the figure of Jesus the teacher can be so clearly discerned, and that so much of his teaching that is not apocalyptic and even non-eschatological should have been kept. These facts are evidence, moreover, of the historical truth of the picture that

the Gospels give of Jesus as one whose method was that of a teacher. An invented Jesus would have been less of a genius, and more impatient.

The statement that Jesus was a teacher is often misapprehended. It does not mean that he was academic or professional in outlook, though the question as to how far he was trained as a rabbi is one to which no indubitable answer has been given. It does not refer only to his sayings, for Jesus taught by what he did and suffered and was, as well as by what he said. His greatest gift to mankind was himself. It does not mean that Jesus was primarily a teacher of ethics, for he taught no ethics apart from religion, no duty that is not based finally upon man's relation to God. It does not mean that he was concerned chiefly with the presentation of a system of truth that would sometime in the future be understood, for he was interested in helping the people of his time to meet their immediate needs and problems. It does not mean, on the other hand, that he was a dispenser of transient formulas for filling in the interim, rounding the corner, and ending the current depression; for his teaching has timeless relevance and eternal truth.

"Jesus did not 'bring' the kingdom of God," says Rudolf Otto. "That idea would be strange to Jesus himself. The kingdom of God brought him."<sup>85</sup> I have sought to show how Jesus, pro-

claiming the kingdom of God in a time of desperate human need, chose the educational method, the method of the teacher, rather than methods of legislation or political action or armed rebellion or violent social revolution.

In the language of modern educational theory, distinguishing marks of the educational method as contrasted with the methods of politics, propaganda, or conflict, are: (a) *Freedom*. The absence of coercion, whether it be by physical constraint or legal penalty or unfair emotional conditioning. (b) *Fellowship*. The pupil is regarded not as an animal to be trained or as a unit to be fitted into an organization, but as a person who is to be respected, trusted, befriended, and helped to grow in responsible freedom and rational self-control. (c) *Objectivity*. Teacher and pupil owe a common submission to those bodies of truth and fact which are relevant to their purposes but which are no mere creation of their desires.

These marks are characteristic of Jesus. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," is a saying attributed to him by the Gospel according to John. Whether or not it records his exact words, this saying certainly expresses the spirit of his teaching. "Nothing in our Lord's ministry impresses me more," says Henry Latham, "than the extraordinary sobriety

of the whole movement. We hear nothing of religious transport or ecstatic devotion. . . . True human freedom was with him a sacred thing; what man was made for was that he might be a free spiritual being; and a man is not free when he is fascinated by fervid oratory and becomes the blind tool of another, or when he is intoxicated by religious fanaticism and is no longer master of his own mind. Any agencies, therefore, which would impair the health and freedom of man's will Christ refused to employ. They belonged to that Spirit of the world whose alliance He had refused."<sup>86</sup>

The accusation that Jesus was beside himself was so obviously contraverted by the facts that no need was felt to conceal the fact that the accusation had been made: and its appearance in Mark is an evidence of the historical trustworthiness of his material. Attempts in recent years, from the standpoint of modern psychology, to prove that Jesus was psychopathic and ecstatic, lacking in balance and sanity, are unconvincing. They are confuted by the patent reasonableness of his teaching and the restraint and fairness of his appeal to those whom he taught.<sup>87</sup>

To say that Jesus' teaching was reasonable is not to reduce it to the dull prose of a classroom lecture, or to hold that it was simply a matter of deduction from premises already established.

Jesus' teaching was vibrant with new life and interest. And it came, in its distinctive aspects, straight from his own intuition and trust, from his experience, as Son, of God as Father. Many a truth, of science as well as of faith, has come to the human mind in the first instance as a flash of intuition, something given, a revelation rather than a discovery; yet once this truth has been seen, it appears also to be reasonable, and it may be presented and taught to others in reasonable ways. That is what Jesus did: without argument or long-winded proof, he presented to men the will and way of God in ways that appealed to their reasonable sense of truth. His parables were in this respect extraordinarily effective teaching instruments.

Jesus did not present a code of laws for conduct, either for his time or for ours. He sought to bring men into right relation with God, and he enunciated certain principles of conduct consequent upon that relation. Of commandments, in the proper sense of the term, he affirmed only two: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The rest of his ethical teaching follows by way of application or counsel from these. Just what in specific detail are the decisions and the paths of action befitting those who in the successive generations seek first the kingdom of God and his



## 108 JESUS AND THE EDUCATIONAL METHOD

righteousness, is left to their judgment and conscience to learn through experience in the light of his Spirit.<sup>88</sup>

When we are exhorted to "build the kingdom of God" in accordance with "the blueprint of Jesus," the figure of speech is misleading. Jesus neither gave to his contemporaries, nor left for future generations, anything resembling a blueprint for social rebuilding, or a road map for the conduct of life, or a time schedule for human history. He did not deprive his followers of their freedom and their responsibility to discern what is the will and kingdom of God in the changing tides of circumstance and the onward march of events.

Jesus' teaching was revolutionary. He called for repentance, and repentance is revolution. In the individual it means the revolution from bondage in the hazards of impulse and the meanness of self-will to the freedom of those who are sons of God. In society it means the revolution from competition to co-operation, from force to reason, from systems of exploitation to an order of mutual service and good will. This is a revolution that can never be brought about by violence, for violence contradicts it; or by the mere study of facts, for it involves changed judgments of value.

The revolution which Jesus sought was never

more urgently needed than today; yet there are those who regard it as impossible. That human nature never changes is the cynical premise in which immovable conservative and impatient radical agree. At bottom, both hold, human nature is just physical hunger, animal lust, and brute selfishness. Reason and good will may have their day when no great issue is at stake, they say, but when life itself is threatened we revert to the primitive drives. Man may be moral in his immediate, face-to-face relationships, it is asserted, but in its larger, impersonal groupings, class to class and nation to nation, society is immoral, and knows no final law save the victory of armed force.

A modern paganism has emerged, with gods of its own making. Sin abounds; but we are told that we must not use the term; we must speak, rather, of maladjustments of personality, or even of "the new morality." Duty is held to be out of date, and conscience regarded as a symptom of pathological repression. Racial antagonisms have sharpened; and men have begun again, as in the days of the Roman Empire, to worship the State, and to compel others to that idolatry.<sup>89</sup>

In the face of this situation, two opposite tendencies with respect to religious education have developed, both of which are erroneous. One is the tendency to cultivate religious educa-

tion without God; the other, the tendency to deny religious education in the name of God.

For faith in God, some would substitute a man-made thing they call "religion." It is an interesting fact that as men lose faith in God they tend to talk about religion. A healthy, robust faith is objective. It thinks and speaks of God and Christ and man, of duty, sin, and salvation, instead of discussing religion. The Bible is supremely the book of religion, yet the word "religion" appears in only three passages. Micah, in his great summary of human duty, did not mention it. Jesus never used the word, so far as the records show.

The word "religion" is a subjective term. It denotes a human response to reality; it is not a name for the reality which awakens the response. It betokens an attitude, and attitudes do not exist in and for themselves. An attitude, if it be sane, has an object. It is an attitude toward something or someone. The primary question with respect to any religion is, What is the character of the object of its devotion?

A recent writer on religion and scientific method holds that religion must be stripped of all cosmic reference, divested of all relation to physical fact or metaphysical truth, and regarded as simply a name for the attitude of love for one's neighbor. We cannot love God, he maintains,

for we cannot know whether there be a god or not. And we cannot decide as to the values of life, for my neighbor's wants may be different from mine and mean as much to him as my wants mean to me. If I really love my neighbor, I am ready to grant that his point of view may be truer than mine, and shall be willing to share with him his doubt or his deprivation. Love forbids me to seek to convert him to my belief, because his may be best for him, he may be right rather than I. Love counsels me, rather, tentatively to adopt his beliefs for myself, in order that I may become really one with him. If he be wrong, we shall in that case at least be wrong together, and I shall be proudly conscious that I tried to make him happy. This conclusion is propounded in the name of the principles of scientific method; but it is more like sentimentality. If religion should ever change into that sort of romanticism, its days are numbered, and ought to be.<sup>90</sup>

In his plausible and spirited Terry Lectures, John Dewey clearly expresses the opposition to theism which has long been implied in his philosophical and educational writings. He would give up all that is denoted by the noun "religion," and keep the adjective "religious" to describe a quality of human activity. A man is religious, according to this view, when he acts in devotion to an ideal, especially if it be against

obstacles and at risk of personal loss. Dewey maintains that belief in God detracts from devotion to ideals, is in reality a subtle form of unbelief or lack of moral faith, and impedes one's service to his fellow men. Unfortunately for his argument, he makes the mistake of naming as outstanding examples of philanthropic devotion three historic figures, William Wilberforce, John Howard, and Florence Nightingale, who were also outstanding examples of faith in God.<sup>91</sup>

The second tendency, which drives too far in the opposite direction, is to deny religious education in the name of God. This is the tendency of those who so exalt the arbitrariness of God's sovereignty, the infinity of his being, his transcendence, his absolute other-ness, as to deny that either in man or in nature can any path toward God be found. It is the tendency, again, of those who overemphasize the nonrational or superrational element in religious experience, the utterly mysterious, the numinous. It is the tendency of those who overstress the rôle in religion of poetry, mythology, and paradox.

Such rarefied faith is not easily distinguishable from religious agnosticism. And history shows that it is hard to keep agnosticism religious. It may be salutary for us to read again Dean Mansel's *The Limits of Religious Thought*, in which he sought to exalt revelation by por-



traying the incompetence of the human mind to think consistently of God; then to recall the fact that this book served as one of the premises of Herbert Spencer's agnosticism and his attempt to reconcile religion and science upon the consideration that science deals with what we know and religion with what we do not know.<sup>92</sup>

Our minds are finite and fallible, be it granted. They are blinded by sin, biased by complexes, prejudiced by tradition, and cramped by social pressure. They are too often the weather vanes of fashion. But with all of their faults, these are the only minds that we have, and we must use them or nothing. To assert, as is sometimes said, that only an infinite mind could know the infinite, and that only absolute knowledge is capable of affirmations concerning the absolute, is to use language that is plausible but specious. Knowledge is not a one-to-one correspondence of knower and known, not a part-by-part, point-by-point absorption of an object apprehended by the apprehending subject. Such an assumption is contradicted not only by mathematical methods of dealing with the infinite but by our common, everyday knowledge of one another. No person ever fully knows another person; no one's apprehension of even his most intimate friend ever exhausts that friend's being. There is always more in another person than we know—

something unexplored, unpredictable—yet our knowledge of other persons, so far as it goes, notwithstanding the possibility of revision in the light of further experience, is really knowledge.

Because our minds fall short of the infinite being of God, and because our apprehension of him is relative and partial, like the apprehension of a person, there is always room for honest differences of understanding and belief, and room for growth in knowledge and faith. Our affirmations concerning God are in terms of analogy, and all analogies are symbols rather than photographs. That is why Jesus taught in parables. We use these symbols, knowing that they are neither exact nor adequate. Christ has taught us that the least inadequate symbols, the forms of thought and speech that best express what we know and may believe about God, are drawn from the relations that ideally hold between parent and child. God is not blind force, or fate, or principle; he is living, active, intelligent Will. God is more than a king, or judge, or exacting creditor; he is a Father, loving, gracious, merciful, and infinitely patient. He is not in passive hiding, waiting to be discovered; he has acted, and does act, in history. Our lives spring from and continually depend upon his creative, sustaining, and redeeming action. And man is more than a subject, or culprit, or debtor. He is a

child of God. The correlate of God's revelation is man's capacity to receive and understand and accept it.<sup>93</sup>

The heart of the Christian faith is the gospel—the good tidings of the kingdom of God. The gospel is not merely that the kingdom of God is in the future, near or far, but that the kingdom of God is here. God reigns, God acts. God manifests his will in the frustrations of human folly and wrong, as well as in the wisdom and strength to be gained by those who seek first his kingdom and his righteousness. Yet the gospel is not merely that the kingdom of God is here, but that the kingdom of God will come and God's will be done on earth as in heaven. The Christian faith, as I have sought to show, is not apocalyptic; but is eschatological. It holds that history has direction, and is moving under the hand of God toward a goal. Sooner or later God's gracious purpose will prevail. Neither God nor man can be finally content with a partial or limited exercise of his sovereignty.

The repentance which the kingdom of God demands is more than the putting away of particular sins that stand between us and God, preventing us from any real sense of his presence and disposition. That is elemental and inescapably necessary. But the repentance appropriate to entrance into the Kingdom involves yet more

of a revolution in our human ways of thinking. We must cease thinking of God as an hypothesis, and acknowledge him as the reality within which our lives are set. We must cease invoking him as a force to be placed at our disposal, a sort of superworkman or genie for the accomplishment of our desires, and seek to adjust our desires to his wisdom and goodness. We must learn to pray with Jesus, "Not my will, but thine, be done." We must realize that the primary fact is not God's reliance upon us, but our dependence upon God; that more determinative than our concept of him, is his purpose for us.

God is not a continent, like Antarctica, lying off somewhere, inert, without relation to human life till some Scott or Amundsen or Byrd finds him. God is no peak, like Mount Washington, to which travelers must go and which they climb step by step. God is like the air we breathe or the earth beneath our feet. To discover him is simply to awaken to reality. It is like a plant discovering the sun and the rain that drew it from the earth or like children discovering the parents who gave them birth and love and nurture.

The Christian faith is being assailed by the forces of paganism today as never before since the early centuries. But that is a great thing. In the very urgency of the battle lies ground for hope.

Christians are being driven in thought and action away from emphasis upon the minor things, the incidental and outlying refinements of theological dogma and the peripheral details of ecclesiastical polity, and are being led by the exigencies of attack and defense to concentrate their minds and will upon the great central truths of the Christian faith.

A new life is astir in the Christian churches. It is finding expression in the conferences held at Oxford and Edinburgh in 1937, and in the subsequent plans for a World Council of Churches. The churches are affirming their faith in the Christian gospel with a fresh realization of its meaning and its truth. They are asserting their freedom, under God, to proclaim this gospel in the face not only of the claims of the totalitarian State to omnicompetence, but of the pretensions of scientific method to a monopoly of knowledge. They are acknowledging their obligation, by God's grace, to give themselves with intelligence and devotion to the redemption of this present world from the unchristian practices, the social and economic injustice, and the downright evil which so largely possess it.

That the new life of the churches will make large use of the educational method is inevitable. Their way is not back, toward obscurantism; but forward, with eyes open to the truth. This new



movement is not sentimental, but realistic. It does not deny science or history or culture; it sees these as instruments to the purpose of God. The natural affiliation of the gospel is not with methods of coercion or violence, propaganda, mob psychology, or emotional hysteria, but with the reasonable persuasiveness of truth, the love of God, and the fellowship of good will.

That the religious-educational movement should share in this new life of the churches and their new realization of the gospel is of the utmost importance. The religious-educational movement has been criticized for failure to be integrated fully into the life of the churches, for neglect of the Bible, for ignorance of theology, for a tendency to substitute devices of method for understanding of the content of Christian teaching, for a tendency likewise to substitute psychology for God, for failure to secure the commitment of young people to the purposes of God and to enlist them in church membership. Applied to the movement as a whole, these accusations are not justified by the facts; but it must be admitted that charges of this sort may properly be brought against much that is done in the name of religious education. The most serious criticism of the movement is that some of its protagonists, in America at least, have been over-anxious to copy the principles and methods of

public education, and have thus lost something of their distinctive purpose and have been too much influenced by the prevalence in American education of the general point of view which has successively worn the names of "pragmatism," "instrumentalism," and "experimentalism."

Evangelism and Christian religious education are not rivals or incompatible, if each be properly conceived, but belong together. Evangelism is the articulate witness to the gospel of Christ, with a view to awaken in others a sense of need, to secure commitment and to inspire faith. We unduly narrow our idea of evangelism if we limit it to the appeal to nonbelievers only, or if we think of it as confined to adults, or to preaching, or to revivals, or to emotional and cataclysmic experiences of conversion. All of these are included in the scope of evangelism; but it is more than any of these. Evangelism is as wide and varied as life itself and as the power of the gospel. Any method or practice, any organization or fellowship, whereby the gospel is brought to bear in effective, saving power upon the lives of people, young or old, is evangelistic.

Mistaken too is the notion that evangelism has reference to what God does in his grace, while education refers to what we do through human effort, as though the two were separable. All

that we do is within limits and by powers that are ordered and sustained by God. Jesus himself, and later Paul, used the analogy of the farmer who sows the seed, while the growth comes from God. Another analogy may be helpful—that of the physician. No physician ever heals a patient. All that the physician can do is to clear the way for natural forces to function properly. He can remove obstructions and disturbing factors, clean up infections, bind wounds, set broken bones, cut out malignant tissue, plan a regimen of food, air, exercise, and rest which will bring re-enforcement at points where it is most needed—but nature does the healing. Like growth, healing comes from God. So too no teacher ever creates insight or will or character; no evangelist ever saves a soul. In these greatest of human endeavors, as well as in the sowing of the seed, we are laborers together with God. Our human efforts are made possible and effective by God's grace. Paul's word is profoundly true: "By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God."

## NOTES

1. Charles F. Kent, *Great Teachers of Judaism and Christianity*, 1911, p. 18.  
     ✓ Frank W. Smith, *Jesus—Teacher*, 1916, p. ix.
2. B. A. Hinsdale, *Jesus as a Teacher*, 1895, p. 230.
3. Bruce Barton, *The Man Nobody Knows*, 1925.  
     J. Middleton Murry, *Jesus—Man of Genius*, 1926.  
     Thomas N. Carver, *The Religion Worth Having*, 1912;  
     and an article on "The Economic Factor in the Messiahship of Jesus," in the *Christian Register*, ci, 1922, pp. 101ff.
- Karl Kautsky, *Foundations of Christianity*, Eng. trans. from 13th German edition, 1925.  
     Bouck White, *The Call of the Carpenter*, 1911.
4. Rudolf Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word*, Eng. trans., 1934, Chap. III.
5. Charles Guignebert, *Jesus*, Eng. trans., 1935, p. 247.
6. Henry Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*, 1905, p. 79.
7. These militant words and phrases are taken here and there from Conrad Noel, *The Life of Jesus*, 1937, and from the chapters by Conrad Noel on "Jesus" and by John Lewis on "The Jesus of History," pp. 51-102, in *Christianity and the Social Revolution*, edited by John Lewis and others, 1935.
8. Henry J. Cadbury, *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus*, 1937, Chaps. VI and VII.
9. Quoted from Friedrich Heiler, *Der Katholizismus*, p. 3, in Walter E. Bundy, *The Religion of Jesus*, 1928, p. 123.
10. Schweitzer's view is set forth in English translations of his books, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God* (published in 1901, translated in 1914); *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (published in 1906, translated in 1910); and his autobiography entitled *Out of My Life and Thought* (published in 1931, translated in 1933).

## 122 JESUS AND THE EDUCATIONAL METHOD

11. Albert Schweitzer, *Out of My Life and Thought*, p. 50.
12. Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, pp. 369, 390, 400.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 351, 361, 369, 401.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 364. *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God*, pp. 101-02.
15. Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, pp. 351, 355f., 374, 392f.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 374, 355f.
17. Albert Schweitzer, *Out of My Life and Thought*, Chap. VI. By permission of Henry Holt and Company.
18. J. Warschauer, *The Historical Life of Christ*, 1927, p. 62.
19. *Ibid.*, pp. 80, 81.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 171.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 89.
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 80, 171f., 175.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 172f.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 85-87.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 241, 254, 299, 320.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 172.
27. C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, 1936, p. 25.
28. Mark 11. 15-17.
29. Isaiah 56. 7. Jeremiah 7. 9-11.
30. Stephen Liberty, *The Political Relations of Christ's Ministry*, 1916, p. 26.
31. B. W. Bacon, *The Apostolic Message*, 1925, p. 234. *The Story of Jesus*, 1927, Chap. VI.
32. In this discussion of Jesus' entry in Jerusalem and his expulsion of the money-changers I have drawn upon, and quoted a few paragraphs from a sermon of mine on "The Realism of Jesus," published in L. A. Weigle, *We Are Able*, Harper, 1937.
33. Frederick C. Grant, *The Economic Background of the Gospels*, 1926, pp. 89, 105. By permission of the Clarendon Press, Oxford.
34. The possible significance of Sepphoris in the early life



- of Jesus has been brought out best by Shirley J. Case, *Jesus, A New Biography*, 1927, pp. 200-12.
35. Joseph Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*. (Eng. trans., 1926, pp. 390, 391.)
  36. *Ibid.*, pp. 375, 402. Luke 12. 1-31.
  37. C. A. Anderson Scott, *New Testament Ethics*, 1930, pp. 31-40. By permission of The Macmillan Company.
  38. È. Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, Eng. trans., 1885, Second Division, Vol. I, p. 230.  
I have availed myself of the better English translation by Frederick C. Grant in his *The Economic Background of the Gospels*, pp. 93-4.
  39. B. W. Bacon, *op. cit.*, p. 235.
  40. Flavius Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book 14, Chap. VII, p. 62.
  41. Matthew 23. 4 = Luke 14. 46. Mark 12. 40 = Matthew 23. 14 = Luke 20. 47.
  42. Mark 12. 13-17 = Matthew 22. 15-22 = Luke 20. 20-26. Matthew 17. 24-27.
  43. Luke 13. 2-5.
  44. Matthew 16. 4; 12. 39-40. Luke 11. 29-30.
  45. I have discussed the meaning of the book of Jonah more fully in a sermon on "The Jonah-motive in Modern Life," published in L. A. Weigle, *We Are Able*.
  46. Mark 1. 15.
  47. Adolf Harnack, *What Is Christianity?* (Eng. trans., 1903, p. 58.)
  48. Bouck White, *The Call of the Carpenter*, pp. 84, 94, 95.
  49. Burton Scott Easton, *Christ in the Gospels*, 1930, Chap. VII.
  50. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 1920, I, pp. 269-270. Similar phrases are used in the Psalms of Solomon 5. 21 and 17. 4; but this use hardly justifies Professor E. F. Scott's statement that the phrase, "kingdom of God," is prominent in the Psalms of Solomon. (*The Kingdom of God*, p. 36.)

## 124 JESUS AND THE EDUCATIONAL METHOD

51. T. R. Glover, *The Jesus of History*, 1917, p. 167.
52. Ernest F. Scott, *The Kingdom of God*, 1931, pp. 51-2. By permission of The Macmillan Company.
53. Compare Henry Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*, pp. 207-8.
54. T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 1931, pp. 134-41, and Chaps. VI, VII, and VIII.
55. Gustaf Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*. (Eng. trans., 1902, p. 94.) George Foot Moore, *Judaism*, 1927, II, pp. 371-72. K. L. Schmidt, article on βασιλεια in G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 1933, I, p. 582.
56. T. W. Manson, *op. cit.*, p. 135.
57. G. F. Moore, *op. cit.*, I, p. 434.
58. Mark 9. 1 = Matthew 16. 28 = Luke 9. 27. Mark 13. 26, 30, 32 = Matthew 24. 30, 34, 36 = Luke 21. 30. Mark 14. 62 = Matthew 26. 64.
59. Maurice Goguel, *The Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans., 1933, p. 570. Mark 2. 17. The convenient edition of the apocalyptic literature is by R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, 1913, Vol. II.
60. Even Enoch 62. 2-63. 10, which F. C. Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, pp. 23-24, holds to be the source of Matthew 25. 31-46, differs from the latter completely in its vindictive and vengeful spirit.
61. R. Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 39.
62. C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, 1909, I, p. cxii.
63. M. Goguel, *op. cit.*, p. 572.
64. Matthew 6. 25-34.
65. Matthew 7. 11.
66. A. B. Bruce, *The Kingdom of God*, 1893, p. 46.
67. That Mark 1. 15 means that the kingdom of God has come and is here is maintained by C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, pp. 44-5; R. H. Lightfoot, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, 1934, p. 107, note; Edwyn Hoskins and Noel Davey, *The Riddle of the New Testament*, 1931, p. 117.
68. Luke 11. 20 = Matthew 12. 28. Luke 17. 21. The best

single volume to aid ministers, teachers, and readers generally in further study of the gospel records with reference to the matters discussed in these lectures is *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, 1938, by H. D. A. Major, T. W. Manson, and C. J. Wright. The texts cited in these notes are discussed on pages 377, 426, 595 of this book. The discussions of other texts may readily be located in its index of scriptural references.

69. Matthew 11. 2-6—Luke 7. 18-23.
70. Rudolf Otto, *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn*, 1934, pp. 84-88. An English translation by F. V. Filson and B. L. Wolfe, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, has just been published, in which this section is on pages 108-12.
71. Luke 10. 23-24 = Matthew 13. 16.
72. Luke 11. 31-32 = Matthew 12. 41-42.
73. Mark 10. 15 = Luke 18. 17. Matthew 6. 33. Mark 12. 34. Matthew 21. 31.
74. Mark 4. 26-29. Mark 4. 30-32 = Matthew 13. 31-32 = Luke 13. 18-19. Matthew 13. 33 = Luke 13. 21.
75. B. W. Bacon, *The Story of Jesus*, 1927, p. 212.
76. Rudolf Otto, *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn*, p. 83. (Eng. trans., p. 107.) I have availed myself of the excellent translation by C. H. Dodd, in *The Parables of the Kingdom*, p. 79, where he quotes the passage. The italics are in the original.
77. Luke 4. 16-21.
78. Matthew 11. 4, 5 = Luke 7. 22.
79. An excellent summary of the present discussion of these points with a critical and doctrinal study of the Passion sayings is found in Vincent Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, 1937. Harnack's dictum is in *What Is Christianity?* p. 154. Hoskins and Davey, *The Riddle of the New Testament*, presents in detail the evidence for the position that the original tradition is Christological.
80. Frank C. Porter, *The Mind of Christ in Paul*, 1930, is a

## 126 JESUS AND THE EDUCATIONAL METHOD

thorough study of the essential relationship between the teaching of Paul and that of Jesus.

81. John 3. 16.
82. George MacDonald, "That Holy Thing."
83. James Moffatt, *The Theology of the Gospels*, 1913, p. 129.
84. C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments*, 1927.
85. Rudolf Otto, *op. cit.*, p. 80. (Eng. trans., p. 103.)
86. Henry Latham, *op. cit.*, p. 213.
87. A convenient summary of these attempts is Walter E. Bundy, *The Psychic Health of Jesus*, 1922.
88. The best brief account of the ethical teaching of Jesus is by C. A. Anderson Scott, *New Testament Ethics*, 1930.
89. Charles G. Robertson, *Religion and the Totalitarian State*, 1937.
90. Edwin A. Burt, *Religion in an Age of Science*, 1929, Chap. V.
91. John Dewey, *A Common Faith*, 1934. A devastating, critical review of this book by Henry P. Van Dusen, appeared in the review, *Religion in Life*, Winter Number, 1935, pp. 123-32.
92. Henry L. Mansel, *The Limits of Religious Thought Examined*, 1858. The relations of Mansel and Spencer are discussed in Robert Flint, *Agnosticism*, 1903, Chap. X.
93. In these paragraphs I have made some use of material contained in my article on "Religious Education and School Administration" in the volume edited by C. M. Hill, *Educational Progress and School Administration*, 1936.

# INDEX

- Agnosticism, 112f.
- Apocalyptic, 7, 21-39, 67f., 81-89
- Apostolic preaching, 102f.
- Ashworth, R. W., 9
- Bacon, B. W., 47, 59, 96, 122f., 125
- Barton, Bruce, 13, 121
- Bruce, A. B., 90f., 124
- Bultmann, R., 16, 87, 121, 124
- Bundy, W. E., 121, 126
- Burkitt, F. C., 124
- Burt, E. A., 126
- Cadbury, H. J., 13f., 20f., 121
- Carver, T. N., 13, 121
- Case, S. J., 123
- Charles, R. H., 124
- Christology, 99f.
- Dalman, Gustaf, 78, 124
- Davey, Noel, 124, 125
- Dewey, John, 11f., 126
- Dodd, C. H., 40, 102, 122, 124, 126
- Easton, B. S., 69, 123
- Economic conditions in Jesus' time, 49-51, 58-61
- Educational method, 105, 117f.
- Eschatology, 22, 79-89, 115f.
- Evangelism, 119f.
- Flint, Robert, 126
- Glover, T. R., 11, 70, 124
- God: as Father, 35f., 38f., 81, 90
  - as Sovereign, 75-79
  - in action, 96-102, 114-116
- Goguel, M., 82, 88, 124
- Gospel, 97-102
- Grant, F. C., 49f., 122f.
- Guignebert, Ch., 16, 121
- Harnack, A., 68, 100, 123, 125
- Heiler, F., 22, 121
- Hinsdale, B. A., 11f., 121
- Hoskins, Edwyn, 124, 125
- Howard, John, 112
- Humanism, 68f., 110-112
- Interim-ethic, 28
- Jackson, F. J. F., 123
- Jesus: as teacher, 11-19
  - as militant, 19f.
  - as vagabond, 20f.
  - as apocalypticist, 21-39
  - as realist and man of action, 40f.
- entry into Jerusalem, 41-43
- denounces exploitation of Temple, 43-48
- call to repentance, 51-65
- his anger, 56f.
- his proclamation of the kingdom of God, 67-97
- his gospel, 97-103
- his choice of the educational method, 103-108
- his reasonableness, 18, 105-108
- his crucifixion, 66f., 103
- his resurrection, 67, 103




- John the Baptist, 14, 23, 30, 73, 92f.
- Jonah, sign of, 63-65
- Josephus, Flavius, 59f., 123
- Kautsky, Karl, 13, 121
- Kent, C. F., 11, 121
- Kingdom of God, 3, 23-25, 36f., 61f., 67-97, 115f.
- Klausner, J., 51-56, 123
- Knowledge of God, 113f.
- Lacy, B. R., 5, 9
- Lake, Kirsopp, 123
- Latham, Henry, 11, 18, 105f., 121, 126
- Latourette, K. S., 9
- Lewis, John, 19f., 121
- Liberalism, 40
- Liberty, Stephen, 46, 62, 122
- Lightfoot, R. H., 124
- MacDonald, George, 101, 126
- Major, H. D. A., 125
- Mansel, H. L., 112f., 126
- Manson, T. W., 74f., 78, 124, 125
- Modernization, 12-14, 68f.
- Moffatt, James, 102, 126
- Montefiore, C. G., 87, 124
- Moore, G. F., 78, 80, 124
- Murry, J. M., 13, 121
- Nationalism, Jewish, 51-56, 85f.
- Nightingale, Florence, 112
- Noel, Conrad, 19f., 121
- Otto, Rudolf, 93, 97, 104, 125, 126
- Paganism, modern, 109, 116f.
- Paul, 101, 120
- Porter, F. C., 125
- Religious education, 118-120
- Repentance, 56-65, 72f., 115f.
- Robertson, C. G., 126
- Sadducees, 43, 45f.
- Schmidt, K. L., 78, 124
- Schürer, E., 58f., 123
- Schweitzer, A., 7f., 22-32, 47, 121f.
- Scott, C. A. A., 57, 123, 126
- Scott, E. F., 70f., 123f.
- Scribes, 15f.
- Sephoris, 50f.
- Sermon on the Mount, 15, 32, 52-54
- Smith, F. W., 11f., 121
- Spencer, Herbert, 113, 126
- Sprunt, James, 5, 8
- Taylor, Vincent, 125
- Thompson, W. T., 9
- Van Dusen, H. P., 126
- Violence, 37f.
- Warschauer, J., 32-39, 47, 122
- White, Bouck, 13, 68f., 121, 123
- Wilberforce, William, 112
- Wright, C. J., 125



# Date Due


F/

<del>RESERVE</del>	<del>RESERVE</del>	Hom.	
(Horn)	Theol. & Chris. Ed.		
<del>Chau</del>	AP 5-54		
	DE 1-55	APR 24 1996	
JA 18 '50	<del>MAY 13 '55</del>		
FE 9 '50	<del>JUN 15 1984</del>	MAY 28 1996	
MY 15 '50			
OC 19 '50			
<del>RESERVE</del>	<del>OGT 27 1995</del>		
(Horn)		JUN 27 1996	
<del>Chau</del>	<del>NOV 17 1995</del>		
OC 24 '52			
FACULTY	<del>DEC 31 1995</del>	DEC 31 1996	
JA 20 '53			
JA 28 '53	JAN 10 1996		
FACULTY	FEB 09 1996		
FACULTY	MAR 9 1996		
	APR 6 1996		
®			
			AUG 27 1996





Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01033 3054